

## ELOHIM, THE ELOHIST, AND THE THEORY OF PROGRESSIVE REVELATION

The peculiar phenomenon of alternating divine names in the Pentateuch, which Julius Wellhausen described as *das Hauptkriterium*<sup>1</sup>, has been one of the starting points of the critical endeavors to excavate its literary pre-history. Throughout the fluctuating course of source criticism, the very reason for the alternation between YHWH and ELOHIM has not been fully settled. Yet, a prevailing argument, often dubbed “the theory of progressive revelation”, has proposed a solution: the divine nature, power, and name were not known fully from the beginning but developed in stages<sup>2</sup>. Within the classical source model, this could mean that some writers — namely P and E — thought the name YHWH was revealed first to Moses at Sinai and thus could not be used prior to this revelation without anachronism. Other writers, such as J, did not share this view or at least were not bothered by the potentially anachronistic use<sup>3</sup>.

The recent challenge to the pre-P connection between Genesis and Exodus raised by today’s redaction critics figures significantly in the evaluation of this theory<sup>4</sup>. The alleged “hiatus” between the two bodies of

<sup>1</sup> J. WELLHAUSEN, *Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Bücher des Alten Testaments* (Berlin 1899) 32.

<sup>2</sup> For an early articulation, see H. HUPFELD, *Die Quellen der Genesis und die Art ihrer Zusammensetzung* (Berlin 1853) 87-88; J.E. CARPENTER – G. HARFORD-BATTERSBY, *The Hexateuch According to the Revised Version* (London 1900) II, 112. For more recent literature, see O. EISSFELDT, *The Old Testament. An Introduction* (Oxford 1966) 183; B.S. CHILDS, *Exodus. A Commentary* (OTL; London 1974) 112; A.F. CAMPBELL – M.A. O'BRIEN, *Sources of the Pentateuch. Texts, Introductions, Annotations* (Minneapolis, MN 1993) 36, n. 38; E.W. NICHOLSON, *The Pentateuch in the Twentieth Century. The Legacy of Julius Wellhausen* (Oxford 1998) 231; R.E. FRIEDMAN, *The Bible with Sources Revealed. A New View into the Five Books of Moses* (San Francisco, CA 2003) 56. Some scholars move a step further and add *kēbôd yhwē* as the next step of this progression. See R. ALBERTZ, *A History of Israelite Religion in the Old Testament Period. From the Exile to the Maccabees* (OTL; Louisville, KY 1994) II, 490; T.B. DOZEMAN, *Commentary on Exodus* (Grand Rapids, MI 2009) 384.

<sup>3</sup> That is, the use of YHWH in J, in either narration or discourse, does not necessarily indicate the possession of knowledge about the name YHWH in J’s narrative world. It could simply mean that the Yahwist did not care about the potential anachronistic use. See R.W.L. MOBERLY, *The Old Testament of the Old Testament. Patriarchal Narratives and Mosaic Yahwism* (Minneapolis, MN 1992) 36-79.

<sup>4</sup> J.C. GERTZ – K. SCHMID – M. WITTE (eds.), *Abschied vom Jahwisten. Die Komposition des Hexateuch in der jüngsten Diskussion* (BZAW 315; Berlin 2002); T. B. DOZEMAN – K. SCHMID (eds.), *A Farewell to the Yahwist? The Composition of the Pentateuch in*

tradition undermines the entire system upon which the supposed progression is based — the *continuity* of the sources. If the patriarchal stories are shown to have been literarily independent of the Moses story before the Priestly connection, the “historical claim”<sup>5</sup> that the first revelation of YHWH occurred to Moses does not affect the pre-P patriarchal tradition.

Whereas the source model has largely faded away in Europe, as far as non-P is concerned, it is very much alive in other contexts. Notably, the theory of progressive revelation has recently been revitalized by Baruch Schwartz and Joel Baden, who represent a group now called the “Neo-Documentarians”<sup>6</sup>. They believe that the divine name criterion is still valid, blaming common misconceptions and erroneous applications of the criterion for the increasing doubt cast upon it. Acknowledging the reality of progressive revelation, which they assert, holds the key to a correct understanding of the use of divine names in the Pentateuch<sup>7</sup>. All biblical students are aware of the fascination of this theory, but its validation has been frustratingly overdue.

In an attempt to update our understanding of the alteration of divine names with today’s Pentateuchal criticism, I would like to re-examine the source-critical theory of progressive revelation and show that this theory, though effective when applied to the Priestly source, does not suit the Elohist. I then consider the implications of this result and alternative solutions that may account for the use of ELOHIM in E, against the backdrop of the preference for ELOHIM in late biblical literature.

## I. P AND PROGRESSIVE REVELATION

Many reasons can be given for why the notion of progressive revelation seems to align well with the Priestly literary presentation. The Priestly writer appears to promote a periodization of divine revelation: “I am YHWH.

Recent European Interpretation (Atlanta, GA 2006); F. GIUNTOLI – K. SCHMID (eds.), *The Post-Priestly Pentateuch*. New Perspectives on its Redactional Development and Theological Profiles (FAT 101; Tübingen 2015).

<sup>5</sup> This and “narrative flow” are the two main criteria that the Neo-Documentarians use in their source-critical analysis. See J.S. BADEN, *The Composition of the Pentateuch*. Renewing the Documentary Hypothesis (New Haven, CT 2012) 16–20, 30.

<sup>6</sup> For this title, see T.B. DOZEMAN – K. SCHMID – B.J. SCHWARTZ (eds.), *The Pentateuch*. International Perspectives on Current Research (FAT 78; Tübingen 2011) 208 n. 2; 370 n. 3.

<sup>7</sup> See B.J. SCHWARTZ, “Does Recent Scholarship’s Critique of the Documentary Hypothesis Constitute Grounds for Its Rejection?”, *The Pentateuch*. International Perspectives on Current Research, 3–16, 11–12; J.S. BADEN, *J, E, and the Redaction of the Pentateuch* (FAT 68; Tübingen 2009) 74, 226–227; ID., *The Composition of the Pentateuch*, 21–23.

I appeared to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob as EL-SHADDAY, but as for my name YHWH, I have not made myself known to them" (Exod 6,2-3). This statement not only precludes any previous knowledge of the name but also gives the name, EL-SHADDAY, by which the patriarchs had known their God<sup>8</sup>. Moreover, this back-reference finds precise echoes in some notable Priestly texts in Genesis, such as Gen 17,1, "YHWH appeared to Abram and said to him, 'I am EL-SHADDAY'", and again in Gen 35,11, "God said to him, 'I am EL-SHADDAY'"<sup>9</sup>. Thus, in the Priestly corpus, until YHWH's name is revealed to Moses, the name YHWH is seldom used by either the narrator or characters in the narrative. The characters in the Priestly narrative in Genesis are rarely given a chance to speak, but when they are allowed to speak, they use EL-SHADDAY, and never YHWH. This absence of YHWH does not prove ignorance of the name; rather it points to an underlying scheme of divine names in P.

Furthermore, the revelation in Exodus 6 functions as a pivot within the Priestly corpus after which an apparent transition occurs<sup>10</sup>. After the name is revealed to Moses, the Priestly narrative appears to use the name YHWH without reservation<sup>11</sup>. This change applies to both narrator and characters. YHWH is used throughout in the Priestly legal corpus as well. Such a transition does bolster the case for progressive revelation, indicating that P's use of ELOHIM and not YHWH prior to the revelation to Moses was not a matter of stylistic preference, theological choice, or avoidance of the sacred name but rather of timing — specifically, when to begin employing YHWH while avoiding its anachronistic usage. Therefore, a consistent factual claim is made throughout the Priestly narrative: the name YHWH was unknown before its revelation to Moses<sup>12</sup>. It is this claim that contradicts

<sup>8</sup> One potential line of objection to this claim is to take this phrase as a "rhetorical negative", interpreting it as "by the name of *yhwh* did I not make myself known to them?" See K.A. MATHEWS, *Genesis 11:27 – 50:26* (NAC 1B; Nashville, TN 1996) 60, n. 157; K.A. KITCHEN, *On the Reliability of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI 2003) 329, 571 n. 52.

<sup>9</sup> See also Gen 28,3; 43,14; 48,3.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. C. HOUTMAN, *Exodus 1:1 – 7:13* (HCOT; Kampen 1993) 93.

<sup>11</sup> Contrast Seitz's remark that after the revelation P does not begin using only YHWH, a statement he does not back up with evidence. C.R. SEITZ, "The Call of Moses and the 'Revelation' of the Divine Name", *Theological Exegesis. Essays in Honor of Brevard S. Childs* (eds. C.R. SEITZ – K. GREENE-MCCREIGHT) (Grand Rapids, MI 1999) 145-161, 163. In fact, P was not bound to use only YHWH after the revelation — which, by the way, was not the claim made by source critics — but was free to use any appellation of choice. The constraint posited by the theory of the progressive revelation applies, again, only to pre-revelation texts and only to the narrative world.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. P's similar systematic treatment of "tent", which, as Baden states, "[...] is not used until the construction of the Tabernacle (first in Exod 26:7)". BADEN, *The Composition of the Pentateuch*, 237.

the view of the Yahwist, who implies that the name YHWH was known from the beginning of human history (e.g., Gen 4,26 <sup>13</sup>).

## II. E AND PROGRESSIVE REVELATION

The situation with regard to E is different and more complex. The revelation of the name YHWH in the E corpus occurs in Exodus 3, earlier than in P in the canonical presentation, making this passage the first time a reader of Exodus in its present form learns about Moses's encounter with YHWH. Unlike the following Priestly revelation, which takes place in Egypt, this revelation occurs at Mount Horeb <sup>14</sup>. When God first appears in the burning bush, God provides a self-identification as the "God of your father" (3,6) without revealing any more personal identity. Negotiating with God, Moses asks for further information in anticipation of the Israelites' likely question, "What is his name?" (3,13). To this, God's initial answer is the well-known, enigmatic *'ehyê 'ăšer 'ehyê* and its shortened form, *'ehyê* (3,14). Only then is the sacred name of God revealed in its complete, undisguised form: "Thus you shall say to the Israelites, 'YHWH, the God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, has sent me to you'" (3,15). This is not the most natural way to answer Moses's question, and the relation between YHWH and the other forms of its attestations remains a subject of debate.

Whether progressive revelation was the reason for E's presentation depends largely on the source analysis of Exod 3,13-15 <sup>15</sup>, the momentous revelation of the sacred name. For source critics, this must be assigned to E, as the anchor upon which other parts of the E corpus are explained. Unfortunately, critics have failed to achieve consensus on the source division of this formative passage <sup>16</sup>. Most source critics take Exod 3,13-15

<sup>13</sup> Moberly does not think Gen 4,26 indicates the knowledge of YHWH in the characters but argues that those are imposed by the narrator. See MOBERLY, *The Old Testament of the Old Testament*, 68-69.

<sup>14</sup> Many have noted this discrepancy, particularly with regard to Ezek 20,5, which places the revelation in Egypt, one of the grounds on which Otto and Schmid promote the post-P dating of Exodus 3-4. E. OTTO, "Die nachpriesterschriftliche Pentateuchredaktion im Buch Exodus", *Studies in the Book of Exodus*. Redaction, Reception, Interpretation (ed. M. VERVENNE) (BETL 126; Leuven 1996) 61-111, 109; K. SCHMID, *Genesis and the Moses Story*. Israel's Dual Origins in the Hebrew Bible (Siphut 3; Winona Lake, IN 2010) 186.

<sup>15</sup> For brief histories of research, see CHILDS, *Exodus*, 60-64; W.H. SCHMIDT, *Exodus 1,1 - 6,30* (BKAT 2; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1988) 169-177.

<sup>16</sup> Literature on this passage is immense. For a brief list, see M. SÆBØ, *On the Way to Canon*. Creative Tradition History in the Old Testament (JSOTSup 191; Sheffield 1998) 78 n. 1.

as the work of E<sup>17</sup>, but this has been done only by suppressing a critical sensitivity to literary inconsistency, especially between v. 14 and v. 15<sup>18</sup>. Besides, the source identification of v. 15 as from E, the most essential decision for progressive revelation, is not free from circular reasoning<sup>19</sup>. In an ordinary situation, this passage would have been taken as Yahwistic, as was the case with the earlier verses where YHWH occurred (3,2.4.7)<sup>20</sup>. The only reason why scholars assign this use of YHWH to E is the assumption that this was the moment when the name YHWH was introduced to humanity according to the E material — an assumption dependent on a source division that assigns v. 15 to E. The contention that this text could not be assigned to J, in which YHWH has long been known<sup>21</sup>, also assumes that the incident depicted in the account is a first revelation of the name to humanity. If it is not a first-ever revelation of the name but rather simply a revelation to Moses, then it does not conflict with J's use of YHWH.

At the heart of the key passage on which the case for progressive revelation in E is based, one finds circularity and lack of control<sup>22</sup>, which calls for a more thorough examination. In examining the case of E, I highlight its differences compared with the case of P as reviewed above.

### 1. *No Rejection of Previous Revelation*

For the argument for E's belief in progressive revelation to stand, the revelation of YHWH in Exodus 3 must be the first revelation to humanity.

<sup>17</sup> E.g., CAMPBELL – O'BRIEN, *Sources of the Pentateuch*, 184-185; W.H. PROPP, *Exodus 1–18. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 2; New York 1999) 224-226; FRIEDMAN, *Sources Revealed*, 122-123.

<sup>18</sup> Many critics take v. 14 as a gloss. For this and other related issues, see CHILDS, *Exodus*, 61-64.

<sup>19</sup> The point here is not that other competing models have a better control over methodological circularity. Nearly all historical-critical endeavors are liable to this problem. Redaction critics also are criticized for circularity in that their wholesale claim for literary hiatus between Genesis and Exodus is achieved only after taking out apparent literary cross connections between them. See BADEN, *The Composition of the Pentateuch*, 58; ID., "The Continuity of the Non-Priestly Narrative from Genesis to Exodus", *Bib* 93 (2012) 161-186.

<sup>20</sup> Not incidentally, Yoreh, who takes the divine name criterion more strictly, assigns this verse to J, claiming it evinces "a classic statement of J's theology". See T.L. YOREH, *The First Book of God* (BZAW 402; Berlin 2010) 174.

<sup>21</sup> See, e.g., BADEN, *The Composition of the Pentateuch*, 120.

<sup>22</sup> As Yoreh puts it, "[...] how can one of the cornerstones of source division rely on a redacted verse or verses?" See YOREH, *The First Book of God*, 6. See also, T. RÖMER, "The Revelation of the Divine Name to Moses and the Construction of a Memory about the Origins of the Encounter between Yhwh and Israel", *Israel's Exodus in Transdisciplinary Perspective*. Text, Archaeology, Culture, and Geoscience (eds. T.E. LEVY – T. SCHNEIDER – W.H. PROPP) (Cham, CH 2015) 305-315, 308.

A careful examination of the text gives us reasons to question this common assumption<sup>23</sup>. Unlike the case of P, the narrative in Exodus 3 does not necessarily reject a previous revelation of YHWH and the knowledge of YHWH among Israelites. What differentiates the case of Exod 6,3 is its claim that appears to reject any previous revelation of YHWH: **ישמי יהוה לא נודעתי להם**<sup>24</sup>. The claim made in the account of Exodus 3 is, as many have observed, Moses's prior ignorance of the identity of the deity who appeared in the bush<sup>25</sup>. Given the generational gap between the two eras, as well as Moses's personal history, it makes sense to surmise that the ignorance was his in particular, which makes it unnecessary to posit that it was shared by his predecessors all the way back to the time of the patriarchs, or even by his contemporary kinfolk<sup>26</sup>. Furthermore, Exodus 3 presents no alternative divine appellation by which patriarchs had known their God, as P presents EL-SHADDAY. Naturally, there is no back-reference in Exodus 3 that would link this revelation to the corresponding passages in Genesis where the alleged alternative name is used, as P's Exod 6,3 does. As Schmid points out, "what is more binding of the revelation in Exodus 6 is the fact that the alternative divine title is clearly given"<sup>27</sup>.

The difference is clear and should not be downplayed. In P the distinction is between the two (quasi-)proper names, YHWH and EL-SHADDAY<sup>28</sup>,

<sup>23</sup> For similar questions raised, see CHILDS, *Exodus*, 60-64; MOBERLY, *The Old Testament of the Old Testament*, 59-62.

<sup>24</sup> Similarly, H.C. BRICHTO, *The Names of God. Poetic Readings in Biblical Beginnings* (New York 1998) 25. Traditionally, the contradiction this passage creates with the uses of YHWH in Genesis has been explained by the fact that in the patriarchal era the meaning of the name was not fully revealed. For discussion, see CHILDS, *Exodus*, 112-113; HOUTMAN, *Exodus 1:1 – 7:13*, 101.

<sup>25</sup> E.g., CAMPBELL – O'BRIEN, *Sources of the Pentateuch*, 185; MATHEWS, *Genesis 11:27 – 50:26*, 59-60; K. BERGE, *Reading Sources in a Text. Coherence and Literary Criticism in the Call of Moses: Models-Methods-Micro-Analysis* (ATSAT 54; St. Ottilien 1997) 116; SEITZ, "The Call of Moses", 158-159; D.M. CARR, "Genesis in relation to the Moses Story: Diachronic and Synchronic Perspectives", *Studies in the Book of Genesis. Literature, Redaction and History* (ed. A. WÉNIN) (BETL 155; Leuven 2001) 273-295, 287; D.K. STUART, *Exodus* (New American Commentary 2; Nashville, TN 2006) 115 n. 27; 170 n. 165; E. BLUM, "The Jacob Tradition", *The Book of Genesis. Composition, Reception, and Interpretation* (eds. C.A. EVANS – J.N. LOHR – D.L. PETERSEN) (VTS 152; Leiden – Boston, MA 2012) 181-211; W. OSWALD, "Lawgiving at the Mountain of God (Exodus 19-24)", *The Book of Exodus. Composition, Reception, and Interpretation* (eds. T.B. DOZEMAN – C.A. EVANS – J.N. LOHR) (VTS 164; Leiden – Boston, MA 2014) 169-192, 177 n. 24.

<sup>26</sup> J. VAN SETERS, "Confessional Reformulation in the Exilic Period", *VT* 22 (1972) 448-459, 457. *Contra* SCHMID, *Genesis and the Moses Story*, 81.

<sup>27</sup> SCHMID, *Genesis and the Moses Story*, 241-242.

<sup>28</sup> The point here is not that EL-SHADDAY completely lacks a generic quality, but that it is more particular than the generic ELOHIM. Regardless of uncertainty concerning the meaning and origin of the name EL-SHADDAY, the way P presents it in Exod 6,2-3 leaves

which may contradict each other, whereas in E it is between the proper name YHWH and the generic title ELOHIM <sup>29</sup>, which can be used alternatively. To say that YHWH was then known as EL-SHADDAY can have implications quite different from saying that YHWH was called God.

This is all the more so when one considers the abundant evidence for the title “God” being preferred over the proper name YHWH in late biblical and post-biblical literature. Admittedly, the two cases may be different, yet there might be some connections, and I explore that line of inquiry below. At this point, it may suffice to note that since E presents neither an outright rejection of previous awareness of the name YHWH or of any alternative name, it is hasty to take all the earlier uses of ELOHIM as indicating ignorance of the name YHWH.

## 2. The Secondary Role of the Name Revelation

Scholars have long observed that multiple motives, themes, and genres are intertwined in this pericope, and among them one must note that the motif of name revelation plays no primary role <sup>30</sup>. With respect to genre, it is most readily classified as a call of the messenger (*Botenspruch*) <sup>31</sup> or a commission to the prophetic office <sup>32</sup>, and its penetrating theme of resistance functions as a thread through which other thematic elements, including the revelation of the name, are woven into a whole <sup>33</sup>. In fact, the revelation of God’s name is so subordinate to the theme of prophetic resistance in the story that the revelation might not have been required had Moses accepted the call outright <sup>34</sup>. In Seitz’s words, “this [the revelation of the

little doubt that it functioned for the patriarchs at least as a quasi-proper name of the deity, alternative to YHWH.

<sup>29</sup> See E. BLUM, *Die Komposition der Vätergeschichte* (WMANT 57; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1984) 471-477.

<sup>30</sup> See MOBERLY, *The Old Testament of the Old Testament*, 13-16; SCHMIDT, *Exodus 1,1 – 6,30*, 106-107; DOZEMAN, *Commentary on Exodus*, 102, 120.

<sup>31</sup> N.C. HABEL, “Form and Significance of the Call Narratives”, *ZAW* 77 (1965) 297-323.

<sup>32</sup> CHILDS, *Exodus*, 55-56.

<sup>33</sup> N.b., Ska argued its genre as “disputation”. See J.L. SKA, “La place d’Ex 6,2-8 dans la narration de l’exode”, *ZAW* 94 (1982) 530-548, 532-537; ID., “Quelques remarques sur Pg et la dernière rédaction du Pentateuque”, *Le Pentateuque en question*. Les origines et la composition des cinq premiers livres de la Bible à la lumière des recherches récentes (eds. A. DE PURY – S. AMSLER) (Le Monde de la Bible 19; Genève <sup>2</sup>1989) 95-125, 98-99.

<sup>34</sup> CHILDS, *Exodus*, 74-76; MOBERLY, *The Old Testament of the Old Testament*, 13; BERGE, *Reading Sources in a Text*, 116; DOZEMAN, *Commentary on Exodus*, 132. Moses refuses four times (3,11; 4,1.10.13), that is, even after the visionary experience of the



name] does not appear to be the main burden of the text, nor even a minor theme”<sup>35</sup>. Indeed, Moses’s reaction to the revelation of the name YHWH is neither awe, nor fear, nor surprise. The narrative leaves the impression that the revelation of the name did little to persuade him, returning promptly to the theme of resistance.

The secondary role of the revelation is also apparent in the broader narrative context<sup>36</sup>. Moses’s knowledge of the name YHWH plays no role in the interaction when he brings the message to the Israelites, contrary to Moses’s expectation in 3,13. The miracles are used (by Aaron) as a sign, but the name is never mentioned. Moses does not explain the name, its meaning, or its historical connection to the God of their fathers<sup>37</sup>. Insofar as Moses’s initial inquiry about the name is motivated by his anticipated rejection as God’s agent, it is ironic that possessing the exclusive knowledge of YHWH does little to heighten his status as the agent “of our God”<sup>38</sup>. It would have only added to the burden of Moses’s commission, because he must now demonstrate and persuade the people of Israel that the God whom he met in no man’s land, a deity with a new and mysterious name (either *’ehyê* or YHWH), is actually their ancestral deity — the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.

Given these considerations, it makes more sense to assume that the Israelites knew of YHWH. This alternative is corroborated by the larger context as well. After Moses’s failed initial confrontation with Pharaoh, when the leaders of Israel complain to Moses and Aaron about the added difficulties imposed on their labor, they say, “May YHWH look upon you and judge!” (Exod 5,21). It would be awkward to posit that the Israelites, despite their utmost disappointment with Moses, have now accepted the name YHWH which he had just introduced to them.

burning bush and YHWH’s presentation of miracles as a sign for his call. Similarly, Aaron comes into the picture only as a secondary measure (4,14) because of Moses’s continued resistance.

<sup>35</sup> SEITZ, “The Call of Moses”, 157. See also, CARR, “Genesis in Relation to the Moses Story”, 286; BERGE, *Reading Sources in a Text*, 116, 118.

<sup>36</sup> The discussion in the following paragraphs assumes the synchronic literary context of the present Exodus narrative and, of course, is not intended for its diachronic implications especially when Exod 3,13-15\* is assigned to a different literary strand, as most critics maintain.

<sup>37</sup> One may argue that the issue of the divine name YHWH is implied when it is said that Moses told them: “Aaron spoke all these words that YHWH spoke to Moses” (Exod 4,30). Still, the lack of attention given to the matter cannot be adequately explained.

<sup>38</sup> B. JACOB, “Mose am Dornbusch. Die beiden Hauptbeweisstellen der Quellenscheidung im Pentateuch, Ex 3 und 6, aufs Neue exegetisch geprüft”, *MGWJ* 66 (1922) 11-33, 12.



In this regard, the scholarly suggestion that Moses's request to know the name was for his own prophetic legitimation <sup>39</sup> might work better. Still, the text presents no evidence that Moses used his knowledge of the name as a proof of being a true prophet, either. Admittedly, one could argue that once the Israelites knew Moses and Aaron were speaking in the name of YHWH, either before them or before Pharaoh, the purpose of this revelation had been met. Yet the paucity of concern for the prophetic legitimacy of Moses and Aaron makes me hesitant to endorse this suggestion. One can posit that later retouches reshaped the text in line with the Deuteronomistic legislation regarding true and false prophecy <sup>40</sup>, but it would be an overstatement to suggest that Moses's inquiry was originally intended for that purpose. Rather, given the dominant motif of prophetic resistance, Moses's request for the proper name of God was more of a desperate act of resistance, as he thinks that God might not share such mysterious, secret information with a nobody like him. To his surprise, the deity had no reservation about sharing not only the name itself but even the deepest secret about the name. Thus, we can conclude that the nature and purpose of this text are far removed from the modern interest in the *terminus a quo* of the human knowledge of the divine name YHWH.

### 3. No Clear Transition around Exodus 3,15

It has been noted above that Exod 6,2.3 functions as a pivot point in P's narrative, at which an apparent shift occurs in the use of divine names, supporting the case for P's progressive revelation. Do we find a similar transition in the case of E? If a clear transition is detected, despite all my previous objections, we would have to concede that some kind of progression is taking place here. A careful examination of the literary context around Exod 3,15, demonstrated below <sup>41</sup>, reveals that there is indeed a transition of some sort, at least within the immediate literary context of Exodus 1–4.

<sup>39</sup> E.g., BLUM, *Die Komposition der Vätergeschichte*, 12; J. VAN SETERS, *The Life of Moses. The Yahwist as Historian in Exodus-Numbers* (Louisville, KY 1994) 47; BERGE, *Reading Sources in a Text*, 119–121; CARR, “Genesis in Relation to the Moses Story”, 286; J. JEON, *The Call of Moses and the Exodus Story. A Redactional-Critical Study in Exodus 3–4 and 5–13* (FAT II.60; Tübingen 2013) 114–119. Cf. J. STACKERT, *A Prophet like Moses. Prophecy, Law, and Israelite Religion* (New York 2014) 70–125.

<sup>40</sup> See JEON, *The Call of Moses and the Exodus Story*, 114–119.

<sup>41</sup> h= HAELOHIM, e=ELOHIM, y=YHWH. In the table, the occurrences of divine names are displayed in two levels in order to distinguish the two levels of discourse: narration (in the lower level) and direct discourse (in the upper level).



use of ELOHIM as a title together with YHWH after the Mosaic revelation raises no question. More problematic, however, is that these uses of ELOHIM are clustered in particular sections (e.g., Exod 13,17-19; Exodus 18-19, Numbers 23-24), as if, for the writers of these sections, the revelation of YHWH did not figure in their choice of divine epithets. This persistence of the Elohist tendency after the revelation of YHWH undermines the case for E's progressive revelation. Unlike P, the use of ELOHIM in E does not appear to be bound as strictly to the grand revelation of YHWH to Moses<sup>48</sup>. Instructive in this regard is the paramount disagreement among source critics in dealing with these post-revelation Elohist sections. Campbell and O'Brien recognized that "after this revelation there is little change within the E material in the use of the divine name"<sup>49</sup>. The use of YHWH in E, in their traditional source division, does not grow exponentially after the revelation. Their subsequent conclusion is all the more telling given the traditional orientation of their source division: "It is therefore unlikely that Exod 3,14-15 is to be regarded in E as an epochal revelation, in contrast to its function in P [...] the avoidance of YHWH throughout the E material may have nothing to do with the revelation or nonrevelation of the divine name"<sup>50</sup>. This classical observation is echoed by some of today's remaining proponents of the Elohist. Most recently, Tzemah Yoreh has maintained that E continues to use ELOHIM after the Sinai revelation. He calls the alleged transition around Exodus 3 "the 'hallowed' contention", which he claims is "simply untenable"<sup>51</sup>. Yoreh dismisses the idea of progressive revelation and, like Campbell and O'Brien, considers it a matter of preference, though he provides no rationale for the choices of divine appellations<sup>52</sup>. Graupner and Zimmer, who are also specialists in E, agree with Yoreh in rejecting the impact of progressive revelation on E<sup>53</sup>.

<sup>48</sup> Against the Documentary Hypothesis, Winnett argues that the sporadic uses of (HA)ELOHIM in Exodus are associated with the event that took place in "the mountain of ha-'elohim". See F.V. WINNETT, *The Mosaic Tradition* (Toronto 1949) 20-29, esp. 21.

<sup>49</sup> CAMPBELL – O'BRIEN, *Sources of the Pentateuch*, 185.

<sup>50</sup> CAMPBELL – O'BRIEN, *Sources of the Pentateuch*, 185.

<sup>51</sup> YOREH, *The First Book of God*, 5.

<sup>52</sup> YOREH, *The First Book of God*, 6.

<sup>53</sup> F. ZIMMER, *Der Elohist als weisheitlich-prophetische Redaktionsgeschichte*. Eine literarische und theologiegeschichtliche Untersuchung der sogenannten elohistischen Texte im Pentateuch (Europäische Hochschulschriften 656; Frankfurt am Main 1999) 41-42; A. GRAUPNER, *Der Elohist*. Gegenwart und Wirksamkeit des Transzendenten Gottes in der Geschichte (WMANT 97; Neukirchen-Vluyn 2002) 4, 7-8. Cf. also, KOHATA, *Jahwist und Priesterschrift in Exodus 3-14*, 23, 66; R.B. COOTE, *In Defense of Revolution*. The Elohist History (Minneapolis, MN 1991) 97-98.

In sum, when Exodus 3 is read within E's literary context, viewed separately from P's comment in Exod 6,3, there is little reason to think that this revelation is intended as a major turning point of human knowledge about the God of Israel, let alone the hidden indicator of the *terminus a quo* of the knowledge of the name YHWH.

### III. LATE ELOHIM PHENOMENON AND E

The foregoing discussion suggests that the striking pertinence of the theory of progressive revelation in P is not matched in the case of E. What E shares with P is its relatively consistent use of ELOHIM and its inclusion of a scene that has been interpreted as the revelation of YHWH. Yet the nature of E's revelation is different from that of P, thus raising questions as to whether E's preference of ELOHIM indeed hinges upon the supposed revelation in Exod 3,15. Indeed, the nature of P in general is radically different from that of E, and the preference for employing ELOHIM is among the few exceptional features they appear to share. Yet, this rare affinity between the two "Elohistic" sources seems accidental rather than essential<sup>54</sup>. The core features of the theory of progressive revelation are rooted in P, and they are then unduly projected onto E.

Against the backdrop of today's redaction-critical scholarship that challenges the pre-P continuity between Genesis and Exodus, this observation cannot be taken lightly, as it has substantial implications for source criticism. Whereas the validity of the divine name criterion can be upheld in the texts where P and non-P texts are compiled (i.e., in the so-called Primeval History<sup>55</sup>), its critical applicability to other parts of the non-P text must be questioned, both before and after the Mosaic revelation<sup>56</sup>. This means that not all occurrences of ELOHIM in the Pentateuch, particularly in the non-P layers, can be accounted for by the neat source-critical solution of progressive revelation. As Brichto has pointed out, "The problem of the

<sup>54</sup> This is no surprise, given that E's separation from P occurred at a later point in the course of development of the newer documentary hypothesis. NICHOLSON, *The Pentateuch in the Twentieth Century*, 8-9.

<sup>55</sup> Note, however, a tendency to diverge from the traditional two-source theory among recent studies on the flood narrative. See, e.g., J.L. SKA, "The Story of the Flood: A Priestly Writer and Some Later Editorial Fragments", *Exegesis of the Pentateuch*. Exegetical Studies and Basic Questions (FAT 66; Tübingen 2009) 1-22; J. BLENKINSOPP, *Creation, Un-creation, Re-creation*. A Discursive Commentary on Genesis 1-11 (London - New York 2011) 133-134.

<sup>56</sup> Similarly, D.M. CARR, *The Formation of the Hebrew Bible*. A New Reconstruction (New York 2011) 106.

names of God in the Hebrew Scriptures is so complex that movements toward the solution may be impeded, distorted, or even blocked by its formulation in the singular” <sup>57</sup>.

Whereas the redaction model might present an alternative explanation for the revelation in Exodus 3, it does not aim at providing an answer as to why certain parts of the non-P tradition prefer ELOHIM over YHWH, or vice versa. It focuses on explaining how the two disparate origin traditions are connected, not why they came to possess different ideas on divine names in the first place. As P harmonizes the patriarchal tradition that employs EL-SHADDAY with the Exodus tradition that employs YHWH by the comment in Exod 6,3 <sup>58</sup>, the non-P bridgework in Exodus 3 juxtaposes the two divergent titles of the God of the fathers: one generic (the God of the fathers in Exodus), the other particular (the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and perhaps YHWH, in Genesis) <sup>59</sup>. The alternation of divine names in the non-P text has been often relegated to the unconscious realm of scribal habit <sup>60</sup>. What is required, then, is to seek an alternative way to account for the uses of ELOHIM in the Pentateuch, or at least some of them, other than by the traditional source-critical avenue.

It is no secret that a great cleft lies between the Pentateuch and the rest of the Hebrew Bible regarding the typical ways in which divine names are interpreted. Within the Pentateuch, YHWH and ELOHIM are used as a gateway to the underlying sources — which, one must note, is far from the most natural explanation. Above all, to trace back the original sources through their uses of divine names was in the first place a tricky business due to the complex process, including traditional and redactional stages, through which the text of Genesis came into being. Even after its final redaction, its growth may not have been fully immune to occasional retouchings, harmonizations, and even changes due to scribal activities, whether intentional or accidental. Text critics have often warned of this pitfall, but their voice has been muffled by higher critics <sup>61</sup>. The

<sup>57</sup> BRICHTO, *The Names of God*, 3.

<sup>58</sup> See SCHMID, *Genesis and the Moses Story*, 248; ID., “The So-Called Yahwist and the Literary Gap between Genesis and Exodus”, *A Farewell to the Yahwist*, 41-42.

<sup>59</sup> E.g., VAN SETERS, “Confessional Reformulation”, 456; R. RENDTORFF, *The Problem of the Process of Transmission in the Pentateuch* (JSOTSup 89; Sheffield 1990) 88-89; T.C. RÖMER, “Exodus 3-4 und die aktuelle Pentateuchdiskussion”, *The Interpretation of Exodus*. Studies in Honour of Cornelis Houtman (ed. R. ROUKEMA) (CBET 44; Leuven – Dudley, MA) 65-79, 74-75.

<sup>60</sup> E.g., E. BLUM, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch* (BZAW 189; Berlin 1990) 25; JEON, *The Call of Moses and the Exodus Story*, 140-141.

<sup>61</sup> The classic debate between Dahse and Skinner is a case in point. Dahse challenged the viability of the divine name criterion mainly on the basis of the variations apparent in divine names in LXX. Yet Skinner came out strongly defending the authenticity of the MT,

idiosyncrasy of the Pentateuchal solution to the divine names has been masked by the fascination that ensued from its discovery.

Attempts to replicate the same result outside the Pentateuch have proven ineffective. Outside the Pentateuch and within prose texts<sup>62</sup>, divine names are used very differently as opposed to within the Pentateuch. Alternations between YHWH and ELOHIM do occur, but within the bounds of ordinary interchange between name and title, just like the alternations between David and “the king” or between Elijah and “the man of God”. If one is to note any characteristic feature, it is certainly not an alternation but a long-noted tendency to avoid YHWH in late biblical literature. Either the sacred name is replaced by generic titles like ELOHIM, or divine epithets are avoided altogether, which many suggest evinces the growing understanding of God’s transcendent nature<sup>63</sup>. Such a tendency continues in the post-biblical era, perhaps lying behind peculiar uses of blank spaces and dots over or in place of the Tetragrammaton<sup>64</sup>. This late tendency to sanctify the name YHWH, one may speculate, might hold a key to explaining the analogous phenomenon of avoiding YHWH in the Pentateuch.

### 1. *The Elohistic Psalter*

Once we put aside the theory of progressive revelation in the non-P text, the artificial cleft between the first five books of the Hebrew Bible and the remaining ones may be reduced. The existence of Elohized texts outside the Pentateuch is instructive. A striking parallel to the Elohistic

mainly by pointing to the Samaritan Pentateuch in which the MT divine names are mostly preserved. See J. DAHSE, *Textkritische Materialien zur Hexateuchfrage* (Giessen 1912); J. SKINNER, *The Divine Names in Genesis* (Expositor’s Library; London – New York 1914). Cf. Carr’s recent comment in CARR, *The Formation*, 106.

<sup>62</sup> Poetic texts are different. The poetic portion of the Book of Job is well known for its peculiar alternation among four titles: EL, ELOHIM, ELOAH, and SHADDAY. A similar phenomenon is observed in the Balaam oracle (Numbers 23–24). Yet in most of the Psalms, such parallel uses of divine appellations are not observed.

<sup>63</sup> G.H. PARKE-TAYLOR, *Yahweh: The Divine Name in the Bible* (Waterloo, ON 1974) 8–9; T.N.D. METTINGER, *In Search of God. The Meaning and Message of the Everlasting Names* (Philadelphia, PA 1988) 15. Note, however, that Segal takes the use of ELOHIM in the Pentateuch as evidence of its antiquity. M.H. SEGAL, “El, Elohim, and Yhwh in the Bible”, *JQR* 46 (1955) 89–115, 112.

<sup>64</sup> At the same time, in post-biblical manuscripts one may not want to overlook the seemingly contrasting, yet essentially related, tendency of giving special treatments to the Tetragrammaton, in which the sacred four letters are not avoided but accentuated by employing archaic Hebrew orthography, even engraved in gold. See E. TOV, *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert* (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 54; Leiden 2004) 218–221, 238–242. As such, this tendency is by no means unidirectional, but the fact remains that there has been a general tendency to sanctify the name YHWH in late biblical literature.

tendency is found in the Elohist Psalter, a group of psalms (Psalms 42–83 or 42–89<sup>65</sup>) that betrays an apparent preference for ELOHIM over YHWH (though the latter is not entirely absent)<sup>66</sup>. However, the superficial affinity between these psalms and the Pentateuchal sources (E and P) on opposite sides of the presumed cleft becomes a source of enigma rather than illumination. The tendency to replace YHWH with ELOHIM in these psalms, regardless of how one accounts for it, cannot be explained in relation to the Mosaic revelation of YHWH. The source-critical solution to the alternating divine appellations, which is tailor-made for interpreting the phenomenon within the Pentateuch, does not work outside the Pentateuch. Precisely that issue, however, is being problematized here. To what degree can we say that the divine name phenomenon in the Pentateuch is endemic to the Pentateuch? And if so, can we reconcile it with the comparable pandemic of symptoms outside the Pentateuch? In point of fact, the mere existence of the Elohist texts outside the Pentateuch, unrelated to the Mosaic revelation of YHWH, reveals a contradiction intrinsic to the artificial dichotomy by which critics conveniently separate the two groups of texts. Pentateuchal scholarship has been adamant about exploring this direction to narrow the gap between the two, and as a result the general late Elohist traits have always been placed in an awkward opposition to the Pentateuch-specific solution of progressive revelation.

Against this, a recent proposal that the Elohist Psalter may have had an earlier date is suggestive. Based on observations of notable traits of these psalms, and a comparison with biblical and Qumranic usages of divine names, Jonathan Ben-Dov concludes that the tendency to avoid YHWH and replace it with ELOHIM in the Elohist Psalter is in fact earlier than has been commonly assumed, beginning in the Persian period<sup>67</sup>. His suggestion puts this phenomenon about the same time as the composition of other biblical literature that also displays a similar distancing from the name YHWH, including biblical wisdom literature, Esther, and Chronicles<sup>68</sup>. If he is right, this early date for the Elohist Psalter may undermine the

<sup>65</sup> L. JOFFE, “The Elohist Psalter: What, How and Why?”, *JSOT* 15 (2001) 142–166, 149.

<sup>66</sup> See JOFFE, “The Elohist Psalter”; see also L. JOFFE, “The Answer to the Meaning of Life, the Universe and the Elohist Psalter”, *JSOT* 27 (2002) 223–235.

<sup>67</sup> J. BEN-DOV, “The Elohist Psalter and the Writing of Divine Names at Qumran”, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Contemporary Culture*. Proceedings of the International Conference held at the Israel Museum, Jerusalem (July 6–8, 2008) (eds. A.D. ROITMAN – L.H. SCHIFFMAN – S. TZOREF) (STDJ 93; Leiden – Boston, MA 2011) 79–104.

<sup>68</sup> Based on similar tendencies observed in the Qumranic *yachad* community and the inclusion of the Asaph and Korah psalms in the Elohist Psalter, and building on Geiger’s old characterization of the Elohist movement as “early halakhah”, Ben-Dov points to “a priestly ideal of protecting the Name” as a possible basis underlying the tendency to avoid using the name YHWH. BEN-DOV, “The Elohist Psalter”, 102–104.



isolation of these psalms from the Pentateuchal layers that employ ELOHIM. Whereas the traditional late dating of the Elohist Psalter had left them far removed from the Pentateuch, an earlier date makes them contemporary with the now widely accepted dating of the final stage of the composition and redaction of the Pentateuch.

## 2. *The Elohim Theology*

When we come back to the Pentateuch, the choice of ELOHIM in P's primeval history, whether or not one construes it in conjunction with progressive revelation, can be related to the growing understanding of the monotheistic perspective. Albert de Pury has argued that P is responsible for the monotheistic elevation of ELOHIM without the definite article as the title for "God"<sup>69</sup>. I remain hesitant to accept some of his arguments, such as his distinctions between the use and non-use of the definite article with ELOHIM and between the generic and proper meanings of ELOHIM as markers of an increasingly monotheistic perspective, since linguistic custom is not always built on such logic. Still, the overall observation that P's use of ELOHIM reflects a developing notion of the monotheistic concept in Israelite religion stands. The implication is that P's employment of ELOHIM can be explained, not as a reflection of the limited extent of revelation in the primeval era, but in line with the general traits of the late biblical era in which the transcendent nature of God was increasingly recognized<sup>70</sup>.

More important than P in our study are the non-P texts. In fact, some of the traditional E texts are being reassessed in a radically different manner today. Achenbach, for instance, building on de Pury's thesis, traces the expansion of P's "ELOHIM theology" in the post-exilic era<sup>71</sup>. It is noteworthy that some of the traditional E texts are included in this category, such as Genesis 20, the Joseph novella, Exodus 18, and Numbers 22–24<sup>72</sup>. It is probably not an accident that these E texts are often featured in recent attempts to search for the post-P layers in the Pentateuch as well. Others have argued for the post-P dating of Genesis 20–22, once considered a major E block in the Abraham story<sup>73</sup>. The Joseph novella is repeatedly

<sup>69</sup> A. DE PURY, "Gottesname, Gottesbezeichnung und Gottesbegriff: 'Elohim' als Indiz zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Pentateuch", *Abschied vom Jahwisten*, 25–47.

<sup>70</sup> This goes against Segal's view that the use of ELOHIM evinces the antiquity of the Pentateuch. See SEGAL, "El, Elohim, and Yhwh in the Bible", 112.

<sup>71</sup> R. ACHENBACH, "How to Speak about GOD with Non-Israelites", *The Post-Priestly Pentateuch*, 35–51.

<sup>72</sup> ACHENBACH, "How to Speak about GOD with Non-Israelites", 41–50.

<sup>73</sup> T. RÖMER, "Le «sacrifice d'Abraham», un texte élohiste? Quelques observations à partir de Gn 22,14 et d'un fragment de Qumrân", *Semitica* 54 (2012) 163–172; M. KÖCKERT,

treated as diaspora literature <sup>74</sup>. Genesis 15\*, often claimed as the beginning of the E text <sup>75</sup>, has become one of the foundational post-P layers <sup>76</sup>. Exodus 3–4\*, which includes the heart of the E corpus, has been identified as a post-P layer <sup>77</sup>.

Of course, one must be careful not to overgeneralize. Yet some intriguing features invite further inquiry along this line. Several traits of the traditional E source have been accounted for as development, both theological and moral, from the earlier J source in the classical documentary hypothesis, and these features fit the supposed late ELOHIM theology well. For instance, E is known for a more developed mode of revelation. God reveals himself either in dreams, from a distance, or through the medium of a divine messenger. Such traits are certainly distinguished from J, which depicts the deity as more immediately present. The prominence of the motif of the fear of God in E has also been understood as betraying a more developed notion of God. Along with the characteristic use of ELOHIM, and except for some secondary stylistic criteria, these are major traits of the traditional E source. In the traditional scheme, this developed state has been used to date E later than J and commonly place it in the northern Israelite kingdom as a parallel document, since J was presumed to have originated in the David-Solomonic era. With J now commonly pushed down to the exilic era, E has lost its pre-exilic place. In today's Pentateuchal studies, then, these features can be seen as general features of a late date. The supposed "ELOHIM theology" also assumes a progressive view of the divine nature, moving from a polytheistic, family god to a monotheistic, universal God. Apparently, these traits of the traditional E are somewhat different from those commonly observed in P. One must remember, however, that the society of ancient Israel and Judah was never so monolithic. Perhaps these traits point to other sectors within society as their provenance, such as a wisdom or prophetic circle. E has often been redefined in wisdom and prophetic terms <sup>78</sup>.

"Gen 20–22 als nach-priesterliche Erweiterung der Vätergeschichte", *The Post-Priestly Pentateuch*, 157–176.

<sup>74</sup> T. RÖMER, "The Joseph Story in the Book of Genesis: Pre-P or Post-P?", *The Post-Priestly Pentateuch*, 185–201; F. GIUNTOLI, "Ephraim, Manasseh, and Post-Exilic Israel", *The Post-Priestly Pentateuch*, 203–232.

<sup>75</sup> See, e.g., CAMPBELL – O'BRIEN, *Sources of the Pentateuch*, 166–167.

<sup>76</sup> SCHMID, *Genesis and the Moses Story*, 158–171; ID., "The So-Called Yahwist", 29–50, 38–39.

<sup>77</sup> SCHMID, *Genesis and the Moses Story*, 172–192.

<sup>78</sup> E.g., ZIMMER, *Der Elohist als weisheitlich-prophetische Redaktionsgeschichte*; R.K. GNUSE, *The Elohist: A Seventh-Century Theological Tradition* (Eugene, OR 2017). For a list of earlier works that articulated E's prophetic origin, see STACKERT, *A Prophet like Moses*, 70 n. 1.

Overall, scholarship appears to be moving toward the possibility that one way to comprehend the preference for ELOHIM in traditional E texts may be to place them within the later, growing tendency to keep a certain distance from the name YHWH.

\*       \*

\*

One can understand why the theory of progressive revelation seemed so compelling for early critics. Biblical students may have all experienced the “aha” moment when they first learned about the idea. However, in the radically changed atmosphere of today’s Pentateuchal criticism, the continuity of the non-P Genesis and Exodus can no longer be assumed. A careful examination reveals that the theory of progressive revelation might not be upheld in E. This means that answering our initial question as to why each source writer employed different names for God will become more complicated than the source model has allowed. Thus, the field is offered the opportunity for a fresh exploration of the logic behind the use of ELOHIM in the Pentateuch, or at least some of its uses, in a way that is more generally applicable to the rest of the Hebrew Bible, without having to resort to a Pentateuch-specific solution.

Yonsei University  
50 Yonsei-ro Seoul  
South Korea  
khong@yonsei.ac.kr

Koog P. HONG

#### SUMMARY

Source critics have long maintained that the theory of progressive revelation holds the key for the non-use of YHWH in P and E. Yet the core features of this theory are rooted in P, and they appear to be projected onto E. This finding opens up an opportunity to narrow the gap between the Pentateuch and other parts of the Hebrew Bible regarding their use of ELOHIM by viewing this usage as a potential sign of relatively late origin, in line with the generally late ELOHIM phenomenon.

## THE CHOSEN CITY: CONQUEST AND SANCTIFICATION TRADITIONS OF JERUSALEM

### I. INTRODUCTION

According to the all-encompassing narrative of the national conquest in Joshua 1–12, the entire land of Canaan was captured in the days of Joshua. Yet the description of the settlement process that followed this conquest, told in the second half of that book (Joshua 15–19), as well as the narrative of conquest and settlement found in Judges 1, allow for the persistence of enclaves, cities, and areas which stayed foreign <sup>1</sup>. According to these conquest traditions, cities with Canaanites and Amorites continued to co-exist alongside Israelite settlements, one side bearing heavily on the other and subjecting the weaker side to forced labor. As far as the biblical traditions are concerned, these enclaves remained foreign. Nowhere in the Bible are we informed of the conquest of such cities as Beth-shean (Josh 17,11-13.16; Judg 1,27-28), Gezer (Josh 16,10; Judg 1,29), Acco (Judg 1,31-32), or Aijalon (Judg 1,35). Among the remaining foreign enclaves we also find Jerusalem, listed either in the territory of Judah (Josh 15,63) or in the territory of Benjamin (Judg 1,21). Jerusalem is the only city from the lists of enclaves to which the Bible dedicates a specific conquest tale. This tale, however, is not a part of the literary cycles of the so-called Period of Conquest, as told in the books of Joshua and Judges. According to the dominant historiographical narrative, Jerusalem remained a foreign enclave until David captured it. It is the last city of the Promised Land to be wrested from its former inhabitants. Historians of the biblical period, however, distinguish between the traditions relating to Jerusalem's capture in the days of David and the accounts of the early settlement of Canaan, in terms of their historical value. The latter — according to both Joshua 1–12 and the depiction of the tribal possession of their allotments

<sup>1</sup> For the different biblical conceptions of the fulfillment of the promise of the land, see N. WAZANA, “‘Everything Was Fulfilled’ versus ‘The Land That Yet Remains’: Contrasting Conceptions of the Fulfillment of the Promise in the Book of Joshua”, *The Gift of the Land and the Fate of the Canaanites in Jewish Thought* (eds. K. BERTHELOT – J.E. DAVID – M. HIRSHMAN) (Oxford 2014) 13-35. For earlier studies comparing Joshua and Judges 1 see WAZANA, “‘Everything Was Fulfilled’”, 29 n. 7.

in Joshua 15–19 and in Judges 1 — are largely regarded as historically unreliable narratives<sup>2</sup>. This assessment rests mostly upon excavations and archaeological surveys which suggest that Israelite settlements during Iron Age I were concentrated in the mountainous region (a thinly-populated area during the Late Bronze Age), and generally constituted small, unprotected, and isolated pockets of inhabited territory far removed from urban centres. This material evidence suggests that the land was never wrested from its autochthonous population in a short, sharp, single rout.

The account of the takeover of Jerusalem, in contrast, is typically viewed as historically authentic; it is presumed that the city either fell into Israelite hands in a military strike (based on 2Sam 5,6-8; 1Chr 11,4-6) or changed hands peacefully via an agreement<sup>3</sup>. The tenet that traditions relating to the beginning of the Israelite city in the days of David are historically reliable reflects the early-twentieth-century belief that “history begins with David”<sup>4</sup>. Even when the general historical reliability of the Davidic cycle came under question, the notion that Jerusalem remained a Jebusite city until the end of the Iron Age I period continued to hold sway<sup>5</sup>. Those

<sup>2</sup> For general surveys, see N. NA'AMAN – I. FINKELSTEIN (eds.), *From Nomadism to Monarchy. Archaeological and Historical Aspects of Early Israel* (Jerusalem 1994); W.G. DEVER, “Ceramics, Ethnicity and the Question of Israel's Origin”, *BA* 58 (1995) 200-213.

<sup>3</sup> See the review in W. DIETRICH, *The Early Monarchy in Israel. The Tenth Century B.C.E.* (trans. J. VETTE) (Atlanta, GA 2007) 181. The peaceful exchange view rests upon the story of the purchase of Araunah the Jebusite's threshing floor and of David's erection of an altar there (2Sam 24,18-25). Some adherents of the notion of a nonviolent shift adjust the story of David's conquest of Jerusalem by reading or interpreting the difficult phrase *wēyiga' bašinnôr* (2Sam 5,8) as *wēyiga' bēšawwārô* — David “touched his neck” as a gesture indicating that he would protect the Jebusites against anyone who sought to attack them. See K. BUDDE, *The Books of Samuel* (trans. B.W. BACON) (Leipzig 1894); see also M. NOTH, *The History of Israel* (London 21960) 191; CH. SCHÄFER-LICHTENBERGER, *Stadt und Eidgenossenschaft im Alten Testament* (BZAW 156; Berlin 1983) 385-396; I. WILLI-PLEIN, “Keine Eroberung Jerusalems: Zu Stellung und Bedeutung von 2Sam 5 in der Davidshausgeschichte der Samuelbücher”, *For and Against David. Story and History in the Books of Samuel* (eds. A.G. AULD – E. EYNIKEL) (Leuven 2010) 213-233.

<sup>4</sup> G. VON RAD, “Der Anfang der Geschichtsschreibung im alten Israel”, *Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament* (München 1958 [1944]) 148-188 = “The Beginnings of Historical Writings in Ancient Israel”, *Problems of the Hexateuch and Other Essays* (trans. E.W.T. DICKENSON) (Edinburgh 1966) 166-204; B. MAZAR, “The Historical Background of the Book of Genesis”, *JNES* 28 (1969) 73-83. Representative of this school of thought is Soggin's assertion: “With the foundation of a united kingdom under David, the history of Israel leaves the realm of pre-history, of cultic and popular tradition and enters the arena of history proper”. See J.A. SOGGIN, “The Davidic-Solomonic Kingdom”, *Israelite and Judean History* (eds. J.H. HAYES – J.M. MILLER) (OTL; London 1977) 332-380, here 332.

<sup>5</sup> Although the reconstructions vary, most scholars agree that Jerusalem was a Jebusite city prior to David. See, for example, SOGGIN, “The Davidic-Solomonic Kingdom”, 350; G.W. AHLSTRÖM, “Was David a Jebusite Subject?”, *ZAW* 92 (1980) 285-287. According

scholars who did question the historicity of Jerusalem's foreign roots viewed the city as one more example of the fictitious group of Israelite sites with foreign roots, a notion generally reflected in the literary list of six or seven foreign peoples <sup>6</sup>. Yet the story of the conquest of Jerusalem is unique in that it is separate from the literary cycles of the conquest of the land and is deferred to the days of David, and the entire issue deserves renewed consideration.

I would like to suggest that the account of the conquest of Jerusalem from "the Jebusites who inhabited the region" (2Sam 5,6) should be understood historically in the context of the reconstruction of the beginnings of Israel in the land, like other biblical conquest traditions. At the same time, the literary uniqueness of this account reflects the ideological role of Jerusalem within the Deuteronomistic cycles — Jerusalem is like no other. The story of its conquest and establishment as the Israelite capital will be reconsidered here in light of the role played by the city in other conquest narratives, and in narratives of the foundation of holy sites.

## II. THE RISE OF JERUSALEM

1Samuel portrays David's conquest of Jerusalem as the first act undertaken by the king after his appointment as ruler over all of Israel. In this account, the capture of the city is thus closely linked with its establishment as the capital of the "United Monarchy". This linkage is further emphasized by the Chronicler, who presents David as taking control of the city during the three days of celebration in Hebron, held to mark his coronation

to Na'aman, "There are a few elements in David's history (e.g., the account of the conquest of Jebusite Jerusalem and the driving [out] of the Philistines from the central hill country) which, in my opinion, reflect genuine memories of his deed"; see N. NA'AMAN, "In Search of Reality Behind the Account of David's Wars with Israel's Neighbours", *Israel Exploration Journal* 52 (2002) 200-224, here 215. In his reconstructions of the days of David, Na'aman also regards David's conquest of the Jebusite stronghold of Zion as an historically reliable account; see N. NA'AMAN, "Biblical and Historical Jerusalem in the Tenth and Fifth-Fourth Centuries B.C.E.", *Bib* 93 (2012) 21-42, here 24; ID., "Jebusites and Jabeshites in the Saul and David Story-Cycles", *Bib* 95 (2014) 481-497, here 487-489. He identifies the Jebusites as Benjaminites, and the stronghold as a former Saulide base converted by Judahite historiography into a pre-Israelite group in order to legitimize David's conquest and aggrandize him (ID., "Jebusites and Jabeshites", 495).

<sup>6</sup> Ch. UEHLINGER, "Die 'Jebusiter': Geschichtliche Hintergründe eines problematischen Jubiläums", *Reformatio* 45 (1996) 256-263, here 260; U. HÜBNER, "Jerusalem und die Jebusiter", *Kein Land für sich allein. Studien zum Kulturkontakt in Kanaan, Israel/Palästina und ebirnâri für Manfred Weippert zum 65. Geburtstag* (eds. U. HÜBNER – E.A. KNAUF) (OBO 186; Freiburg 2002) 31-42.

(1Chr 11,1-9; 12,39-40) <sup>7</sup>. Most scholars accept the historical accuracy of this story, attributing Jerusalem's selection as capital to its geographical and tribal neutrality: "David was a diplomatic genius in establishing Jerusalem as the royal capital of the twelve-tribe federation. The city was both centrally-located and extra-territorial, ideal for consolidating the N and S tribes" <sup>8</sup>.

Although similar statements appear in numerous studies from Albrecht Alt onwards <sup>9</sup>, this position is plagued by contradictory arguments. In the wake of Alt's influential 1925 paper, Jerusalem is frequently alleged to have been a neutral, peripheral, mountainous site whose rise to power was due to political and social considerations rather than its natural potential. David's primary reason for choosing it was accordingly explained as his intention to turn it into an independent base of power under his exclusive control <sup>10</sup>. Other scholars, however, have also adduced its geographical and strategic aspects — e.g., its position in a mountainous saddle in an important regional crossroads that controlled the largest constant water source in the area (the Gihon spring) <sup>11</sup>.

The first view is consistent with the biblical portrait of the election of the city as due to God's choice, despite its inferior natural features. Yet second-millennium BCE textual sources and archaeological data alike favor the second view, pointing to the city's importance in ancient times long before it was chosen by David, the "diplomatic genius". Thus, for example, Jerusalem is the only city in the mountainous region referred to in the eighteenth-century BCE Egyptian execration texts <sup>12</sup>. Reich and

<sup>7</sup> S. JAPHET, *I & II Chronicles* (OTL; Louisville, KY 1993) 232-234; M. OEMING, "Die Eroberung Jerusalems durch David in deuteronomistischer und chronistischer Darstellung (II Sam 5,6-9 und I Chr 11,4-8): Ein Beitrag zur narrativen Theologie der beiden Geschichtswerke", *ZAW* 106 (1994) 404-420.

<sup>8</sup> P.J. KING, "Jerusalem", *ABD* III, 753-754.

<sup>9</sup> A. ALT, "Jerusalems Aufstieg", *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel* (München 1968 [1925]) vol. 3, 243-257, here 252-254. See also, among others, J. SIMONS, *Jerusalem in the Old Testament* (Leiden 1952) 60-62; K.M. KENYON, *Digging Up Jerusalem* (London 1974) 42-43; M. COGAN, "David's Jerusalem: Notes and Reflections", *Tehillah le-Moshe. Biblical and Judaic Studies in Honor of Moshe Greenberg* (eds. M. COGAN – B.L. EICHLER – J.H. TIGAY) (Winona Lake, IN 1997) 193-201; B. HALPERN, *David's Secret Demons* (Grand Rapids, MI 2001) 317-320.

<sup>10</sup> F.M. CROSS, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic* (Cambridge 1973) 230; SOGGIN, "The Davidic-Solomonic Kingdom", 350.

<sup>11</sup> See J.M. CAHILL, "Jerusalem at the Time of the United Monarchy", *Jerusalem in Bible and Archaeology. The First Temple Period* (eds. A.G. VAUGHN – A.E. KILLEBREW) (SBLSymS 18; Atlanta, GA 2003) 13-80, here 14, and the bibliography cited therein.

<sup>12</sup> For an earlier series inscribed on bowls, see K. SETHE, *Die Ächtung feindlicher Fürsten, Völker und Dinge auf altägyptischen Tongefässcherben des Mittleren Reiches* (Berlin 1926) 53, e27-28; 58, f18; and for a later text inscribed on a figurine, see G. POSENER, *Princes et pays d'Asie et de Nubie. Textes hiératiques sur les figurines d'envoûtement du*



Shukron's excavations of the impressive remains of Middle Bronze Age II fortifications in the area of the Gihon spring include massive four-meter-thick walls composed of "cyclopean" stones, each weighing between one and two tons<sup>13</sup>. These unparalleled fortifications, as well as Jerusalem's status in the fourteenth century BCE according to the el-Amarna letters, attest to Jerusalem's significance long before its "surprising" rise to power during the days of David<sup>14</sup>.

### III. DAVID'S CONQUEST OF THE CITY (2SAM 5,6-10)

The view that Jerusalem remained under non-Israelite control until the days of David rests heavily on 2Sam 5,6-10. A brief five verses long, this text poses numerous problems.

In its extant form, it appears to combine two traditions, reconstructed here. Indeed, the weaving of the two traditions was done by an expert hand, but the two are fundamentally different in their content, vocabulary, style, and even genre, connected only by the shared protagonist, David, and by their relevance to his capture of Jerusalem:

1. The first tradition refers to David's antagonism towards the blind and the lame (vv. 6, 8). This tradition mentions Jerusalem and the Jebusites "who inhabited the land", and reports an exchange of words and sayings: what the Jebusites say to David; what he says to them; and an aetiological saying that closes the unit.
2. The second tradition relates David's capture of the "stronghold of Zion", which he renames the "City of David", expanding it "from the Millo inward" (vv. 7, 9). This tradition is a conquest report, recounting the capture, renaming, and building activities typical of successful kings.

Despite the fact that they are intertwined, the divergent character of these traditions and the disparate toponyms to which they refer (Jerusalem and

Moyen Empire (Bruxelles 1940) text E.45. In both occurrences, it is written *Rušalimum*. Nadav Na'aman's suggestion that the execration texts do not refer to Jerusalem (N. NA'AMAN, "Canaanite Jerusalem and its Central Hill Country Neighbours in the Second Millennium B.C.E.", *UF* 24 [1992] 275-291, here 278-279)), has not been widely accepted.

<sup>13</sup> R. REICH – E. SHUKRON, "Light at the End of the Tunnel: Warren's Shaft Theory of David's Conquest Shattered", *BAR* 25.1(1999) 22-33; 72; ID., "Jerusalem. The Gihon Spring and Eastern Slope of the City of David", *New Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations* (ed. E. STERN) (Jerusalem 2008) vol. 5, 1801-1807.

<sup>14</sup> See D.D. PROSKE, *David's Jerusalem. Between Memory and History* (London 2015) 217-223.

Jebusite vs. Stronghold of Zion and City of David) attest to their independent origins<sup>15</sup>. The recognition of the original distinctiveness of these traditions also explains why David appears to pose the call to strike the Jebusites (v. 8) following the report of his capture of the Stronghold of Zion (v. 7)<sup>16</sup>. In their conjoined form, they follow an editorial note summarizing David's rule: "David was thirty years old when he became king, and he reigned forty years. In Hebron he reigned over Judah seven years and six months, and in Jerusalem he reigned over all Israel and Judah thirty-three years" (2Sam 5,4-5). The concluding verse 10 is not part of the original traditions underlying the literary unit, but a brief note about David growing stronger due to divine support, where God is fittingly called, "YHWH, the God of Hosts". This verse closes the unit with the same word that opened it, יָלַךְ<sup>17</sup>. The conquest report is in turn followed by a summary of David's kingship and the children born to him in Jerusalem (vv. 11-16). The style of these editorial notes is typically Deuteronomistic, and the final, combined form of the story of the capture of Jerusalem in vv. 6-10 belongs to this literary layer<sup>18</sup>.

The major exegetical problems of the unit are found in the first of the two traditions (vv. 6, 8). They concern the obscure phrase *wēyiga' bašinnôr* in v. 8, and the triple reference to the "blind and the lame"<sup>19</sup>. The Chronicler

<sup>15</sup> I reject the harmonistic attempt of Tyson to present the combination of the two separate literary strata as a unified creation with deliberate chiasmic structure; see C.W. TYSON, "Who's In? Who's Out? II Sam 5,8b and Narrative Reversal", ZAW 122 (2010) 546-557. Frolov and Orel note the different names for Jerusalem in the pericope, wondering why "David starts with going to one city (Jerusalem) and finishes with seizing another one (Zion)"; yet their solution is harmonistic: "The only sensible way to deal with this distribution of place-names is to believe that Zion and Jebus at this time were two closely located but separate sites also known under the general name of Jerusalem"; see S. FROLOV – V. OREL, "David in Jerusalem", ZAW 111 (1999) 609-615, here 612.

<sup>16</sup> This problem is one of the reasons why Ina Willi-Plein suggested that the story was not about conquest: "Ein Rezept zur Eroberung Jerusalems kann v. 8aa nicht sein, weil der Satz erst nach der Einnahme der Fluchtborg gesprochen wird [...]"; see WILLI-PLEIN, "Keine Eroberung Jerusalems", 228.

<sup>17</sup> See A.R. CERESKO, "The Identity of 'the Blind and the Lame' (*'iwwēr ûpissēah*) in 2Samuel 5:8b", CBQ 63 (2001) 23-30, here 24, and the earlier literature mentioned there.

<sup>18</sup> The combined account, however, may well have had an earlier history. See WILLI-PLEIN, "Keine Eroberung Jerusalems", 213-216, who reconstructs a source she names "Davidshausgeschichte", extending from 1Sam 14,47 through 1Kings 2; this is not our present concern, however. For the Deuteronomistic editing and arrangement of the Davidic stories, see SOGGIN, "The Davidic-Solomonic Kingdom", 333.

<sup>19</sup> See the various commentaries, in particular P.K. MCCARTER, *II Samuel. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 9; Garden City, NY 1984) 135-142; A.A. ANDERSON, *2 Samuel* (WBC 11; Dallas, TX 1989) 79-85, and further bibliography listed in TYSON, "Who's In? Who's Out?", 546-547 n. 1. Frolov and Orel ("David in Jerusalem", 609) list ten textual and exegetical questions.

resolved the textual difficulties by ignoring both issues, interpreting David's words as an incomplete conditional sentence. He understood the narrative as a military account explaining the rise of Joab son of Zeruiah and added an apodosis to David's words: "David said: 'Whoever attacks the Jebusites first will be the chief officer'". He then proceeds to elucidate the protagonist's identity: "Joab son of Zeruiah attacked first and became the chief" (1Chr 11,6)<sup>20</sup>. Tur-Sinai suggests that the Chronicler read **וַיַּגַּע בְּצִירוֹיָה** ("ben-Zeruiah touched") instead of **וַיַּגַּע בַּצִּנּוֹר**, thus giving rise to the midrashic tradition that Joab conquered Jerusalem<sup>21</sup>. But, in the light of the Chronicler's avoidance of the entire "blind and lame" motif, which is mentioned thrice in the 1Samuel account, it appears his retelling was meant to convey a different message in general from that of the account he had before him (see below).

Following the discovery of Warren's shaft in 1867, it was suggested that this structure should be identified with the *šinnôr*, in light of the fact that the term *šinnôr* occurs in the context of water (cf. Ps 42,8), and on the assumption that the shaft formed part of the city's water system<sup>22</sup>. According to this understanding, David's men would have used the shaft to secretly enter the city. In this framework, Jerusalem would have been captured due to Joab's infiltration of the city via Warren's shaft ("touching the shaft"), from which he would have launched a surprise attack along the lines of the attack on Beth-el (Judg 1,24-25). A different course of interpretation is supported by the Septuagint translation, ἀπαξίφιδι ("strike with a dagger"), which reads the *b* as instrumental rather than signifying an indirect object<sup>23</sup>. Sukenik suggested that *šinnôr* connotes a three-pronged pitchfork, on the basis of Targum Onqelos, which renders **צִנּוֹרְתָא** for Hebrew **מִזְלָג** (cf. Exod 27,3; 38,3; Num 4,14);

<sup>20</sup> I. KALIMI, "The Capture of Jerusalem in the Chronistic History", *VT* 52 (2002) 66-79.

<sup>21</sup> N.H. TUR-SINAI, "wēyiga' bašinnôr", *Leshonenu* 13 (1944-1945) 98-105 (Hebrew).

<sup>22</sup> W.F. BIRCH, "Zion, The City of David", *PEQ* 10/4 (1878) 178-189. Amongst those who have accepted this ingenious suggestion is J. BRASLAVI, "'Vayiga batzinor', 'hivirim ve-ha-pischim' (2Sam 5:6-8)", *Beit Mikra* 14 (1969) 3-16 (Hebrew). *šinnôr* occurs on several occasions in rabbinic literature in relation to water flow: e.g., *m. Erub.* 10:6; *m. Mikw.* 4:1; *b. B. Batra* 59a. Some medieval commentators, such as Radak and Ralbag, also understood the word to signify a "water channel"; modern translations follow suit: "gutter" (KJV), "watershaft" (RSV), "water channel" (NJPSV). For other ancient and modern translations, see T. KLEVEN, "The Use of *šnr* in Ugaritic and 2Samuel V 8: Hebrew Usage and Comparative Philology", *VT* 44 (1994) 195-204, though Frolov and Orel ("David in Jerusalem", 614) dispute his interpretation of Ugaritic *šnr* = "pipe". To the two biblical instances (2Sam 5,8; Ps 42,8) we should also add the feminine plural form **צִנּוֹרוֹת** (Zech 4,12) — i.e., the funnels or tubes on either side of the lamp stand.

<sup>23</sup> For this usage, see E. KAUTZSCH, (ed.), *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar* (trans. A.E. COWLEY) (Oxford 1910) §119o.

this would have functioned as an apparatus for scaling the wall <sup>24</sup>. Tur-Sinai also viewed the *b* as instrumental and adduced the analogy of “striking with a blinding light” נכה בסנורים (Gen 19,11; 2 Kgs 6,18). The similarity of the words צנור and סנור leads Tur-Sinai to explain the capture of the city by virtue of God striking the soldiers with temporary blindness; this fits the reference to the blind (supplemented by the lame).

These interpretations, however, contradict the customary meaning of *ng' + b* as “to strike at”: e.g., Gen 26,11; Josh 9,19; 2Sam 14,10 (people); Gen 32,26.33 (limbs); Ezek 17,10 (vegetation); Job 1,19 (objects, such as houses) <sup>25</sup>. According to this understanding, David was referring to beating the Jebusites by striking the watercourse. Another line of interpretation sees the combination *wēyiga' bašinnôr* as referring to hitting the windpipe or gullet, i.e., striking lethal blows <sup>26</sup>; this alternative retains the meaning “to strike at” for *ng' + b*, but assumes a unique meaning for the word *šinnôr*, which is nowhere attested.

Today, we know that Warren's shaft would not have allowed David or his men access to the city; the excavations in the area of the spring have demonstrated that the shaft is actually a natural fissure in the limestone, which only connected with the water system in the eighth century BCE when the Middle Bronze Age II water system was replaced by “Hezekiah's tunnel” <sup>27</sup>. The *šinnôr* may, however, refer to the Gihon spring and/or the Siloam channel, in which case the attack on the city was to take the form of damaging its water source. Fear of just such an event is a common motif in the ancient world. The description of the preparations to Sennacherib's campaign in 2Chr 32,4, for example, reads: “A large force was assembled to stop up all the springs and the wadi that flowed through the land, for otherwise, they thought, the king of Assyria would come and find water in abundance” <sup>28</sup>.

<sup>24</sup> E.L. SUKENIK, “The Account of David's Capture of Jerusalem”, *JPOS* 8 (1928) 14-16.

<sup>25</sup> See KAUTZSCH – GESENIUS §119k; S.R. DRIVER, *Notes on the Hebrew Text and the Topography of the Books of Samuel* (Oxford 1913) 259; TYSON, “Who's In? Who's Out?”, 550, n. 15. This meaning also renders unlikely Na'aman's proposal that “the King ordered his men to remove the impurity that might have resulted from smiting the Jebusites by touching a cataract of dashing water” (Na'aman, “Jebusites and Jabeshites”, 486) — purification by water is nowhere else described using the verb *ng'*.

<sup>26</sup> See McCARTER, *II Samuel*, 137.

<sup>27</sup> REICH – SHUKRON, “Light at the End of the Tunnel”. For an attempt to retain the reconstruction of the conquest of Jerusalem via the waterways, either historically or as an historical possibility in the days of the author (when Warren's shaft was connected to the system), see J.C. POIRIER, “David's ‘Hatred’ for the Lame and the Blind (2Sam. 5.8A)”, *PEQ* 138.1 (2006) 27-33.

<sup>28</sup> The idea that David captured the city by controlling the waters of the Gihon and the Siloam system has been accepted by many, *inter alia* Y. YADIN, “The Blind and Lame and the Capture of Jerusalem by David”, *World Congress of Jewish Studies*. Summer

The first tradition used in our pericope (2Sam 5,6.8) does not explicitly refer to David's actual conquest of the city. It mentions the blind and the lame three times, following verbs denoting speech: 1) "David was told, 'You will not come in here unless you remove the blind and the lame'" <sup>29</sup>; 2) "David said: 'Anyone who attacks the Jebusites striking the water course, and [strikes] the lame and the blind who are hateful to David ...'"; 3) "That is why they say: 'No one who is blind or lame may enter the House'".

The first verse of this tradition ends with an almost verbal repetition of the first clause of the speech to David, this time referring to David in third person: "saying: David will not enter here". The repetition may appear to be a *Wiederaufnahme* (resumption), marking as a gloss the words "unless you remove the blind and the lame", but both clauses depend on the aetiological ending of this tradition, again phrased as a quote: "That is why they say: 'No one who is blind or lame may enter the House'" (8b). Rather than constituting a secondary aetiological element added to the narrative of the conquest of Jerusalem <sup>30</sup>, this common proverb prohibiting the entry of the blind and lame into the "House" preexisted independently of this tradition <sup>31</sup>, which developed by concretizing it.

This aetiological construction resembles the two accounts that associate Saul with the prophets. These, too, end with the quotation of a proverb: "Thus the proverb arose: Is Saul too among the prophets?" (1Sam 10,12).

1947 (Jerusalem 1952) vol. 1, 222-225 (Hebrew); BRASLAVI, "'Vayiga batzinor'", 11-12; B. MAZAR, *The Mountain of the Lord* (Garden City, NY 1975) 168-169; COGAN, "David's Jerusalem", 196; J.R. CHADWICK, "Jerusalem, I: Archaeology", *Encyclopedia of the Bible and Its Reception* 13 (2016) 1002-1032, here 1005.

<sup>29</sup> The form of the word הִפִּיל is that of a *hiphil* infinitive construct with genitive suffix (KAUTZSCH – GESENIUS, §114d), with David as the subject, rather than a *hiphil* verb in perfect tense with pronominal object suffix, with David as the object, indicating a threat, *contra* KAUTZSCH – GESENIUS, §106m. The preceding conjoined particles כִּי אִם mean "except," delimiting or forming a contrast with the preceding, negative clause "you will not come in here" (BDB 474, -אִם 2), and do not indicate an asseveration, following an oath or a curse (*contra* TYSON, "Who's In? Who's Out?" 550, n. 13, who refers to Gesenius 1910, §149d). I follow here the KJV, which translates: "Except thou take away the blind and the lame, thou shalt not come in hither" rather than the NJPS (similarly RSV): "You will never get in here! *Even the blind and the lame will turn you back!*".

<sup>30</sup> For the opinion that the saying is a secondary addition, see, for example, DRIVER, *Notes on the Hebrew Text*, 261; H.W. HERZBERG, *I & II Samuel* (trans. J.S. BOWDEN) (OTL; Philadelphia, PA 1964) 269; S.M. OLYAN, "Anyone Blind or Lame Shall not Enter the House: On the Interpretation of Second Samuel 5:8b", *CBQ* 60 (1998) 218-227, here 219; FROLOV – OREL, "David in Jerusalem", 612; POIRIER, "David's 'Hatred'", 27; and others mentioned in CERESKO, "The Identity of 'the Blind and the Lame'", 27, notes 15-16; TYSON, "Who's In? Who's Out?" 555, n. 27.

<sup>31</sup> ANDERSON, *2Samuel*, 85; TYSON, "Who's In? Who's Out?" 554.

In the second account, this proverb is preceded by the introductory formula, “That is why people say” על-כן יאמרו (1Sam 19,24), identical to the formula used in our story (2Sam 5,8b). The saying/proverb regarding Saul appears to have arisen due to his characteristic irrational behaviour, designated by the *hitpael* of the root *nbʿ*. (1Sam 18,10; cf. 16,14-16; 19,9) <sup>32</sup>. Both accounts of Saul interpret the proverb literally; they concretize a metaphorical saying, transforming it into an anecdote about a public instance of Saul’s extraordinary behaviour in the company of others acting as prophets <sup>33</sup>. The two stories reflect diverse judgments of Saul, the first positive and the second negative; the use of the same literary device in both highlights the contrast.

In this episode about David we find a similar literary phenomenon: the concretization of a saying found at the end of the episode. The disparity between the proverb and story is clearly apparent. The “House” most likely originally alluded to the Temple, as indicated by the Septuagint’s rendering, οἶκον κυρίου (“House of the LORD”) <sup>34</sup>. The saying relates to the priestly law according to which blemished priests (headed by the blind and lame) cannot serve in the Temple (Lev 21,17-23) <sup>35</sup>. As Josephus indicates, these two categories represent all bodily defects: “the blind, and the lame, and all their maimed persons” (*Ant.* 7.61; cf. *Jer* 31,7; *Job* 29,15). The phrase, “No one who is blind or lame may enter the House”, is thus a *merism*, forbidding all disabled persons, rather than exclusively priests, to enter the Temple <sup>36</sup>. Blemished people are excluded

<sup>32</sup> I.L. SEELIGMANN, “Aetiological Elements in Biblical Historiography”, *Zion* 26 (1961) 141-169, here 159 (Hebrew); Y. ZAKOVITCH, “Is David also among the Prophets? 1Sam 21:11-16 in Circles of Inner-biblical Interpretation”, *Shnaton. An Annual for Biblical and Ancient Near Eastern Studies* 11 (1997) 114-130, here 123-124 (Hebrew with English abstract).

<sup>33</sup> For the literary impulse to concretize, apparent in the interpretation of metaphoric expressions by means of an expanded story, see Y. ZAKOVITCH, “The Concretization of Metaphors and Metaphoric Language in the Bible”, *Shnaton. An Annual for Biblical and Ancient Near Eastern Studies* 24 (2016) 5-55, here 5-6 (Hebrew with English abstract).

<sup>34</sup> OLYAN, “Anyone Blind or Lame”, 219-220. See also the scholars cited by S. VARGON, “The Blind and the Lame”, *VT* 46 (1996) 498-514, here 500 n. 4.

<sup>35</sup> The disqualification also related to animals sacrificed in the Temple (Lev 22,21-25; *Deut* 15,21; *Mal* 1,8.13). The Mishnah refers to similar animal defects as representative of all blemishes: “whose eye is blind; whose hand is cut off; whose leg is broken” (*m. Bek.* 5:5); “even if his leg is broken and his eye is blind” (*t. Bek.* 3:7).

<sup>36</sup> Milgrom allows for the possibility that this rule refers to the priests alone, or that it refers to all Israelites; see J. MILGROM, *Leviticus 17–22* (AB 3A; New York 2000) 1826. But I find no hint in the proverb to priests. The *Temple Scroll* alludes only to the blind, yet there the prohibition against entry was extended to all of Jerusalem, perhaps because the blind are considered a source of defilement; see E. QIMRON, *The Temple Scroll. A Critical Edition with Extensive Reconstructions* (Judean Desert Series; Beersheba – Jerusalem 1996) 63. Y. Yadin’s (*The Temple Scroll*, 3 vols. Jerusalem 1977–1983 [1:291]) suggestion

from the sacred sphere and divine encounters, whether due to the implied sin which brought their infliction upon them, or because of their inherent potential to defile <sup>37</sup>.

What event does the author of our passage adduce as that which generated this proverb? In our passage, the general prohibition in the proverb, **לֹא יָבֹא** (“may not enter”), is applied explicitly to David, in the speech of the Jebusite defenders: **לֹא תָבֹא** (“you shall not enter”), **לֹא יָבֹא דָוִד** (“David shall not enter [v. 6]). The “blind and the lame” also take on concrete (plural) form, becoming an element of the Jebusite forces; they demonstrate the hubris of the Jebusite defenders who mock David, as noted early on by Josephus:

But the Jebusites, who inhabited the city and were of Canaanite race, shut their gates against him, and placed on the wall those who had lost an eye or a leg or were crippled in any way, to mock at the king; these cripples, they said, would prevent him from entering (Josephus, *Ant.* 7.61) <sup>38</sup>.

In this way, the proverb prohibiting the blemished from entering the Temple is made to explain David’s hatred for the lame and the blind (2Sam 5,8a<sub>2</sub>). It is difficult to decipher the original meaning of this tradition, situated as it is in the early stages of contact between David and Jerusalem. It has been suggested that this motif may be grounded in David’s apologetics regarding the annihilation of the house of Saul; the only other reference to the lame in Samuel relates to Mephibosheth, Saul’s grandson, whose legs were crippled (2Sam 4,4) <sup>39</sup>. This in turn may support the idea that the account of David’s conquest of Jerusalem relates implicitly to the theme of the struggle between the houses of David and Saul (2Sam 3,6-39; 4,1-12; 21,1-14; etc.). In our story, the mocking words of the Jebusite blind and lame, “you will not come in here”, ignite David’s hatred of the lame and blind. These words may be seen as an indirect allusion to problems with Mephibosheth, and through him to the feud between the houses <sup>40</sup>.

that in the *Temple Scroll* too the blind are representative of all other handicapped categories is disputed: see S.M. OLYAN, “The Exegetical Dimensions of Restrictions on the Blind and the Lame in Texts from Qumran”, *Dead Sea Discoveries* 8 (2001) 38-50, here 41 n. 13.

<sup>37</sup> S.M. OLYAN, *Disability in the Hebrew Bible* (Cambridge 2008) 31-32.

<sup>38</sup> H.St.J. THACKERAY – R. MARCUS, *Josephus with an English Translation* (The Loeb Classical Library; Cambridge, MA – London 1934) vol. 5, 391.

<sup>39</sup> See VARGON “The Blind and the Lame”; CERESKO, “The Identity of ‘the Blind and the Lame’”, 25-26.

<sup>40</sup> CERESKO, “The Identity of ‘the Blind and the Lame’”, 25. I object, however, to his notion that the focus on David, together with the saying “the blind and the lame shall not enter the house” (v. 8b), refer to the end of the Saulide dynasty (“house” meaning kingship) — symbolized by the last heir, the lame Mephiboshet — and the Davidic one, symbolized



Polak noted the significance of the sematic field of the word *bayit* in David's tales, and especially in the story of Mephibosheth<sup>41</sup>; the use of the phrase "No one who is blind or lame may enter the House" plays a role in this larger scheme. The Chronicler, who ignores the entire theme of the feud between the houses, not surprisingly omits the references to the lame and blind in their entirety, choosing instead to develop a new plot around a new protagonist — Joab son of Zeruiah<sup>42</sup>.

The second tradition used in our passage (2Sam 5,7,9) is a simple, coherent report, which resembles other traditions about David's conquests (cf. 2Samuel 8; cf. the phrase "David captured" [2Sam 5,7; 8,4]). The same root *lkd* is connected also to traditions about the conquest of the land, such as the Israelites' capture of Jericho (Josh 6,20); Ai (Josh 8,19); the cities of the southern coalition (Josh 10,32.37.39); Hazor (Josh 11,10); and the Judahites' capture of Jerusalem (Judg 1,8), along with Gaza, Ashkelon and Ekron (Judg 1,18)<sup>43</sup>. Our verses constitute not so much a proper account as a note referring to David's conquest of *Měšudat* (stronghold) Zion, identified by the author with the City of David. It ends with the aetiological naming of the *Mešudah* "the City of David" (2Sam 5,9), thus presenting an altogether different focus from that of the first tradition, with its interest in the Jebusites, the blind and the lame, and David's hatred of them.

by the last king, Zedekiah, who was blinded (2 Kgs 25,7). Ceresko's interpretation, followed by J. SCHIPPER, "Reconsidering the Imagery of Disability in 2Samuel 5:8b", *CBQ* 67 (2005) 422-434, is a midrash. See also Olyan's criticism of this idea (*Disability in the Hebrew Bible*, 141-142, n. 7).

<sup>41</sup> F.H. POLAK, "David's *bayit* in the Light of Frame Semantics: Theme and Central Ideas of the David Tales and Beyond", *The Books of Samuel. Stories — History — Reception History* (ed. W. DIETRICH) (BETL 284; Leuven 2016) 317-331, here 322-323, 329. Polak suggested that "the SF (semantic field) *bayit* dominates the David narratives at least from the account of the building of his palace (2Sam 5,11)". The first tradition of the conquest of Jerusalem (1Sam 5, 6,8) pre-shadows this element.

<sup>42</sup> The Chronicler mentions Mephiboshet by the name Merib-baal, but only in the genealogical lists (1Chr 8,34 [2 times]; 9,40). For his motivation for introducing (or — according to some — preserving an existing tradition of) Joab in his version of the capture of Jerusalem, see R. GILMOUR, "Who Captured Jerusalem? Reading Historiography and/or Collective Memory in Samuel", *The Books of Samuel. Stories — History — Reception History* (ed. W. DIETRICH) (BETL 284; Leuven 2016) 63-82, here 67-69, and the bibliography cited therein.

<sup>43</sup> The same verb describes the capture of a place when this is followed by the change of its name, such as the Danites' capture of Leshem—Dan (Josh 19,47), and Othniel's capture of Kiriath-Sepher—Debir (Josh 15,17; Judg 1,13). It also describes other conquests unrelated to the traditions of the conquest of the land, such as Abimelech's capture of Shechem and Thebez (Judg 9,45.50) and Joab's capture of Rabbah in Ammon (2Sam 12,26-29). For the narrative template of conquering a city and renaming it, see GILMOUR, "Who Captured Jerusalem?", 74-75.

#### IV. OTHER BIBLICAL TRADITIONS RELATING TO THE CONQUEST OF THE CITY

In its present location, the story of David's takeover of Jerusalem renders this the final act in the Israelites' settlement of the land; formerly the city was occupied by non-Israelites. The name Jebus appears only in the Chronicler's version of our story (1Chr 11,4-5) and in Judges' account of the Outrage at Gibeah (Judg 19,10-11) — four times in all<sup>44</sup>. On both occasions, the city is explicitly identified with Jerusalem: "Jebus — that is, Jerusalem" (Judg 19,10) / "David and all Israel set out for Jerusalem, that is Jebus" (1Chr 11,4). The gentilic form "(the) Jebusite" appears forty-one times, designating inhabitants of the land (cf. Gen 15,21; Deut 7,1) or of Jerusalem (cf. Josh 15,63), or describing the city itself (cf. Josh 18,28). The gentilic form is probably primary; the name Jebus constitutes a secondary derivation from it<sup>45</sup>.

In addition to the accounts of the conquest of Jerusalem in Samuel and Chronicles, other — partially contradictory — biblical traditions relate its capture and the defeat of its original inhabitants (not identified as Jebusites). Multiple conquest traditions relating to one site are not uncommon; numerous traditions exist regarding the capture of various cities during the settlement period, e.g., Gaza (Josh 10,41; 11,22; 15:27; Judg 1,18); Debir (Josh 10,38-39; 11,21; 15,15-17; Judg 1,11-13); and Hazor (Josh 11,10-11 vs. Judg 4,2). In contrast to these, however, some of the traditions which show Jerusalem becoming an Israelite city prior to David appear to have been deliberately changed or muted (see below). I shall discuss here the traditions found in Joshua and Judges 1.

##### 1. *The Battle against the Southern Coalition (Joshua 10)*

The first explicit reference to Jerusalem in the Bible is in the account of the conquest of the land in Joshua. Adoni-zedek, king of Jerusalem, initiates and spearheads a southern coalition against Joshua and the Israelites (Josh 10,1-2). Following his death and entombment in a cave at Makkedah (Josh 10,23-26), Joshua and the Israelites continued their campaign, capturing the cities of the Shephelah (lowlands) and the southern

<sup>44</sup> The Septuagint testifies to a fifth mention of "and Jebus, that is Jerusalem" in Josh 18,28, where MT has the gentilic "and the Jebusite, that is Jerusalem". See HÜBNER, "Jerusalem und die Jebusiter", 31.

<sup>45</sup> S.A. REED, "Jebus", *ABD* III, 652; Y. AMIT, *Hidden Polemics in Biblical Narrative* (trans. J. CHIPMAN) (Leiden 2000) 140 n. 27; NA'AMAN, "Jebusites and Jabeshites", 481-482.

mountain region — Makkedah, Libnah, Lachish, Eglon, Hebron, and Debir (Josh 10,28-39) <sup>46</sup>. The city's significance is reflected in the fact that Adoni-zedek is the first king in Joshua mentioned by name rather than title alone (cf. "the king of Jericho" [Josh 2,2-3; 6,2] and "the king of Ai" [8,1-2.14.23.29]). While Adoni-zedek plays a key role in this account — similar to that of Jabin, king of Hazor, the instigator and leader of the northern coalition (11,1) — the fate of his city remains obscure. Unlike other central cities, which are said to have been burnt to the ground — Jericho (6,24), Ai (8,28), and Hazor (11,10-11) — we are not told what happened to Jerusalem.

The sweeping summaries that conclude the narrative of the campaign against the southern coalition (Josh 10,40-42) and the northern coalition, at the very end of the conquest period (Josh 11,16-20), indicate that the author-editor responsible for the conquest story in the first half of the book of Joshua (Joshua 1-12) believed that the Israelites subjugated the entire land — including Jerusalem — under Joshua <sup>47</sup>. The king of Jerusalem also appears in the list of the thirty-one kings whom Joshua and the Israelites defeated (Josh 12,10), though this may not necessarily indicate the fate of his city. In its present form this account conspicuously lacks any statement on the capture of Jerusalem during this period.

## 2. *The Traditions of the Conquest of Jerusalem in Judges 1*

According to scholarly consensus, Judges 1 constitutes an alternative conquest narrative <sup>48</sup>. This chapter refers directly to the seizure and burning of Jerusalem: "The Judahites attacked Jerusalem and captured it; they put it to the sword and set the city on fire" (Judg 1,8) <sup>49</sup>. Judges 1,1-2

<sup>46</sup> Joshua 10 is composed of three separate, originally independent traditions: the story of the battle at Gibeon (vv. 1-15); the account of the five kings at the cave at Makkedah (vv. 16-27); and the conquest of the southern cities (vv. 28-39). See M. NOTH, "Die fünf Könige in der Höhle von Makkedah", *Aufsätze zur biblischen Landes- und Altertums-kunde* (ed. H.W. WOLFF) (Neukirchen-Vluyn 1971 [1937]) Vol. 1, 281-293; J.A. SOGGIN, *Joshua* (OTL; London 1972) 121; V. FRITZ, *Das Buch Josua* (Handbuch zum Alten Testament I/7; Tübingen 1994) 109-115; T.B. DOZEMAN, *Joshua 1-12* (The Anchor Yale Bible 6B; New Haven 2015) 424.

<sup>47</sup> N. WAZANA, *All the Boundaries of the Land*. The Promised Land in Biblical Thought in Light of the Ancient Near East (trans. L. KEREN) (Winona Lake, IN 2013) 185-206.

<sup>48</sup> Cf. A.G. AULD, "Judges 1 and History: A Reconsideration", *VT* 25 (1975) 261-285; E.T. MULLEN JR., "Judges 1:1-36: The Deuteronomistic Reintroduction of the Book of Judges", *HTR* 77 (1984) 33-54 and the bibliography cited therein.

<sup>49</sup> The attempts to reconcile this tradition with that of its conquest by David by appealing to chronological and ethnic factors — by arguing, for example, that Jerusalem was originally captured by the Judahites, who annihilated its Amorite population in the

states that the Judahites were the first tribe to take possession of their promised inheritance: "After the death of Joshua, the Israelites inquired of the LORD: 'Which of us shall be the first to go up against the Canaanites and attack them?' The LORD replied: 'Let [the tribe of] Judah go up. I now deliver the land into their hands'". The reference to Jerusalem in Judg 1,8 is preceded by an account of the opening battle of the campaign of Judah and Simeon against Adoni-bezek, king of Bezek (vv. 4-7).

This passage is problematic on several counts. Why are the Judahites (and their near-neighbours the Simeonites) portrayed as fighting in Bezek, which lies in the territory of Manasseh<sup>50</sup>? Why is Adoni-bezek brought to *Jerusalem* to die (v. 7)? How are Adoni-bezek and Adoni-zedek (whom the LXX identifies as Adoni-bezek in Josh 10,1) associated?

I would like to suggest that we are dealing here with two levels of tradition, a "Judahite" layer and a "Davidic" redaction<sup>51</sup>. The earlier Judahite account of the conquest appears to have commenced with the story of the Judahites' wresting of *Jerusalem* from Adoni-zedek. The current enemy king's name Adoni-bezek testifies to the shift the original tradition underwent. As George Moore noted early on, compound names such as "Adoni-x" are theophoric; the x always represents a divine name rather than a place (cf. Adonijah; 2Sam 3,4)<sup>52</sup>. Yet *bezek* is not a divine name. Despite the close homophonic similarity between Adoni-zedek and Adoni-bezek, the use of the latter name here is not merely a copyist's error. The presence of the Adoni-bezek story seems a deliberate rhetorical strategy: an attempt to displace Jerusalem from its prominent position in this conquest tradition. In addition, Bezek evokes Saul's first battle against the Ammonites (1Sam 11,8)<sup>53</sup>. Thus, by interjecting the Judahite conquest of Bezek, the redactor simultaneously preserved the tradition of

second half of the thirteenth century BCE, and was later inhabited by the Jebusites, a new ethnic group, until the days of David ca. 1000 BCE — are unconvincing, as they are based on conjectural assumptions driven solely by the need to harmonize between various traditions. The most prominent of these attempts is that of MAZAR, *The Mountain of the Lord*, 49-50. HERZBERG, *I & II Samuel*, 268, alternatively proposed a geographical harmonization, i.e., that the Judahites captured only the pasture areas described as lying within the territory of the city in the delineation of the tribal allotments.

<sup>50</sup> For the location and possible identification of Bezek, see P. WELTEN, "Bezeq", *Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästina-Vereins* 81 (1965) 138-165.

<sup>51</sup> This layer should probably be identified with one of the Deuteronomistic redactions, but the issue of the various reductions to Judges 1 are beyond the scope of the current paper.

<sup>52</sup> G.F. MOORE, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Judges* (Edinburgh 1895) 115-116.

<sup>53</sup> See M. WEINFELD, *the Promise of the Land*. The Inheritance of the Land of Canaan by the Israelites (Berkeley, CA 1993) 125.

Jerusalem's non-Israelite history and glorified Judah, the tribe to which David belonged, at the expense of Saul and the site of his own first heroic deed. Notwithstanding the shift from Jerusalem to Bezek in vv.4-7, a trace of the tradition of the Judahites' capture and the burning of Jerusalem remains in v. 8, perhaps because it was impossible to completely ignore the tradition attributing the conquest of Jerusalem to Judah.

Other features of the story also point to the original prominence of Jerusalem in it. Adoni-bezek's comment regarding the seventy kings who used to pick up scraps under his table (Judg 1,7) attests to the importance of his city, a status that befits Jerusalem more than the nondescript Bezek. In addition, the other conquest traditions in Judges 1 refer to major Israelite sites — Hebron (Judg 1,10.20) and Bethel (vv. 22-26), for example. The entire chapter is pro-Judahite; half the chapter is dedicated to their — virtually entirely positive — achievements (Judg 1,1-20).

#### V. THE BIBLICAL TRADITIONS REGARDING JEBUSITE JERUSALEM

The downplaying of Jerusalem from the conquest traditions in Joshua and Judges 1 complements the Davidic traditions in 2Samuel and reflects the attempt to bestow a unique status upon the city: in contrast to the many places captured by the Israelites as they took possession of the land, Jerusalem was conquered only by David. The association of David, Jerusalem and the "United Monarchy" in 2Samuel and Chronicles is brought into prominence because he did not capture the city while his leadership was acknowledged only by a part of the people, but only after he had been anointed as king over the whole of Israel<sup>54</sup>. According to this view, Jerusalem thus rose to prominence because it was *chosen* to serve as the capital of the "United Monarchy" under the house of David. As Fokkelman notes, the designation "City of David" first appears (2x) in the story of David's conquest of Jerusalem (2Sam 5,7.9). The only other occurrences of the phrase appear in 2Samuel 6, in another founding tradition linked to David, namely, the story of his bringing the Ark to Jerusalem (2Sam 6,10.12.16)<sup>55</sup>. By this act, David confirmed the status of Jerusalem as his religious and political capital. David's connection with the city is further highlighted by the reiteration of his name throughout 2Samuel 5.

<sup>54</sup> SIMONS, *Jerusalem in the Old Testament*, 60; Ch. SCHÄFER-LICHTENBERGER, "David und Jerusalem — ein Kapitel biblischer Historiographie", *ErIsr* 24 (1993) 197\*-211\*, here 198\*-199\*.

<sup>55</sup> J.P. FOKKELMAN, *Narrative Art and Poetry in the Books of Samuel*. Vol. 3: Throne and City (II Sam. 2-8 & 21-24) (Assen 1990) 159, notes 12-13.

Following his initial introduction as “the king” (v. 6), he is referred to by name ten times in five verses (6-10) <sup>56</sup>.

The story of David’s conquest of Jerusalem also characteristically alludes to the city’s original inhabitants as Jebusites rather than Canaanites (cf. Judg 1,1) or Amorites (cf. Josh 10,6; note also the mention of the Amorite “father” and Hittite “mother” of Jerusalem along with the land of the Canaanites in Ezek 16,3,45). The Jebusites were one of the local peoples associated with the hill country (cf. Num 13,29; Josh 11,3) <sup>57</sup>. Na’aman suggested that the fact that the Jebusites appear last in many of the lists is “probably due to the fact that according to biblical historiography David subdues the Jebusites, and hence they were the last group among the six/seven nations that the Israelites subjugated” <sup>58</sup>. There is no such correlation, however, between the formulaic lists and the detailed stories. Unlike general statements, specific conquest traditions mention names of cities rather than ethnic affiliations, whether referring to their kings or their inhabitants (Josh 2,3; 6,21, etc.). Where specific ethnic affiliations are mentioned, we find Canaanites (Josh 16,10; 17,2-13 for example), Amorites (10,5-6,12; Judg 1,34-35), and Hivites (Jos 9,7; 11,19), besides the Jebusites of Jerusalem (2Sam 5,6,8). No conquest tradition pertains to the Hittites, Perizzites, or Girgashites, who are listed all the same, and so it is unlikely that the story of David’s conquest of Jebusite Jerusalem determined their position in the lists of pre-Israelite peoples.

Conquest traditions assert explicitly that the city remained a Jebusite enclave, whether the failure to conquer it be laid at the feet of the Judahites (cf. Josh 15,63) or the Benjaminites (Judg 1,21). Like the names of other cities which are connected to Israel’s traditions in its early times — Qiryat-(ha)arba/Hebron, Luz/Beth-el and Qiryat-sepher/Debir — Jebus/Jerusalem is a double name, utilized in order to distinguish between the site’s ancient, pre-Israelite existence and its Israelite one <sup>59</sup>. However, of all cities in the land of Canaan, conquered or not, Jerusalem alone was Jebusite; likewise, it is the only city said to have remained a foreign enclave, vanquished later by none other than the head figure of the Deuteronomistic historiography, King David, initiator and ruler of the “United Monarchy”.

<sup>56</sup> Noted by CERESKO, “The Identity of ‘the Blind and the Lame’”, 25.

<sup>57</sup> The peculiar identity of Jerusalem’s inhabitants was noted by PIOSKE, *David’s Jerusalem*, 229.

<sup>58</sup> NA’AMAN “Jebusites and Jabeshites”, 481.

<sup>59</sup> On this point, see HÜBNER, “Jerusalem und die Jebusiter”, 35-36.

One of the major pillars on which the acceptance of the historicity of this “Jebusite perspective” rests is the incident of the Outrage at Gibeah, where Jerusalem is referred to as “Jebus — that is, Jerusalem” (Judg 19,10; cf. 1Chr 11,4-5). Jerusalem’s non-Israelite character is the sole reason for its mention in the story. When the Levite’s servant suggests that they “turn aside to this town of the Jebusites and spend the night in it” (Judg 19,11), his master answers, “We will not turn aside to a town of aliens who are not of Israel” (v. 12). Since this text relates to the period of the Judges and is seemingly unconnected to David, it has customarily been regarded as a historically reliable witness to Jerusalem’s non-Israelite character prior to David <sup>60</sup>.

As with the alternative conquest tradition in Judges 1, however, this text is not as innocent as it appears at first glance. The protagonists of this horrifying tale are never explicitly named, known only by either title or relationship to other characters — the Levite, his concubine, his servant, his father-in-law / the girl’s father, an old man, his virgin daughter, the depraved men of the town. This anonymity objectifies the characters <sup>61</sup>, thus highlighting the true focus of the narrative — the contrast between the gracious hospitality given to the Levite in Bethlehem of Judah and the barbarity of the inhabitants of Gibeah of Benjamin, which recalls that of the Sodomites (Gen 19,3-9). As Yairah Amit has demonstrated, toponyms frequently play a seminal role in biblical narrative as a form of “symbolic geography” <sup>62</sup>. In this case, “The transition from Bethlehem to Jerusalem directs the reader to turn his thoughts to David” <sup>63</sup>. The reference in this story to the city Jebus, that is Jerusalem, thus appears to be a deliberate ploy on the author’s part, introduced in order to indicate that the Levite’s fear was in fact misplaced: the real threat came not from foreigners

<sup>60</sup> “Jerusalem was clearly an alien city in the time of the judges, as is evident from the story of the concubine at Gibeah, which mentions Jerusalem only in passing”; see Y. ZAKOVITCH, “The First Stages of Jerusalem’s Sanctification under David: A Literary and Ideological Analysis”, *Jerusalem. Its Sanctity and Centrality to Judaism, Christianity and Islam* (ed. L.I. LEVINE) (New York 1999) 16-35, here 17.

<sup>61</sup> D.M. HUDSON, “Living in a Land of Epithets: Anonymity in Judges 19–21”, *JSOT* 62 (1994) 49-66, underscores the role of anonymizing characters in Judges 19–21; he suggests that this is a ploy designed by the author of the Book of Judges to universalize violence and represent social disintegration and dismemberment, since “anonymity infuses chaos and disorder” (*ibid.*, 61; see 62-63). He ignores, however, the fact that the places in the story are explicitly named and thus doubly emphasized in this context.

<sup>62</sup> Y. AMIT, “The Functions of Topographical Indications in the Biblical Story”, *Shnaton. An Annual for Biblical and Ancient Near Eastern Studies* 9 (1985-1987) 15-30, here 25-26 (Hebrew); AMIT, *Hidden Polemics*, 178-183.

<sup>63</sup> AMIT, *Hidden Polemics*, 183; *contra* M. AVIOZ, “The Role and Significance of Jebus in Judges 19”, *BZ* 51 (2007) 249-256, who rejects the idea of an allusion to David.



— Jebusites dwelling in Jerusalem — but from villains from within, the Sodom-like inhabitants of Gibeah, the city of Saul. This story cannot thus be considered an objective witness to the foreign status of Jerusalem in the period of the Judges. In fact, there is no evidence — literary or archaeological — to the existence of “the clan of Late Bronze III Canaanites called Jebusites [...] who lived at the site during the two centuries before it was captured from them by David”<sup>64</sup>.

## VI. THE BIBLICAL TRADITIONS OF THE ORIGINS OF JERUSALEM’S SANCTITY

Jerusalem enjoys a privileged position in different sections of the Bible<sup>65</sup>. Here, however, I would like to shed light on its absence from Pentateuchal sanctifying traditions. In my view, this absence points to a similar process of erasure of Jerusalem from the early legends in favor of its representation as the only chosen (Davidic) city. The sacred nature of other cultic centres in Canaan derives primarily from constitutive events and epiphanies linked with the founding fathers. Hebron was David’s first capital; it was associated with Jerusalem in the conquest traditions as a participant in the southern coalition headed by Adoni-zedek (Josh 10,3). It is holy, however, because God appeared there to Abraham, who consequently built an altar there (Gen 13,18) and purchased a burial place for Sarah at the site (Genesis 23); all the other forefathers and foremothers (with the exception of Rachel; Gen 35,19-20) were also buried there (Gen 25,9-10; 49,31; 50,13). Beersheba, Beth-el, Shechem, Gilead, Mizpah, Mahanaim, Penuel, and Succoth are similarly tied to early founding traditions — places where the patriarchs visited, lived, received divine visitations, or placed standing stones and altars. Jerusalem, the city to which the Deuteronomistic tradition gives special prominence, is conspicuously absent from these *hieroi logoi*, no direct reference to it appearing throughout the Pentateuch<sup>66</sup>.

<sup>64</sup> Quoted from CHADWICK, “Jerusalem”, 1002. As for archaeological evidence, “Occupation in the city during this period is demonstrated by fragments of collar rim storage jars in the Late Bronze/Iron I terraces inside the city wall line” (ibid. 2006); these are precisely the indications for the Proto-Israelite Iron I settlements, and there is nothing “Jebusite” about them.

<sup>65</sup> E. OTTO, “Jerusalem, II: Hebrew Bible/Old Testament”, *Encyclopedia of the Bible and Its Reception* 13 (2016) 1032-1036; J.L. SKA, “Why Does the Pentateuch Speak so Much of Torah and so Little of Jerusalem?”, *The Fall of Jerusalem and the Rise of the Torah* (eds. P. DUBOVSKÝ – D. MARKL – J.-P. SONNET) (FAT 107) Tübingen 2016 113-128, here 113, see further here, n. 1.

<sup>66</sup> HÜBNER, “Jerusalem und die Jebusiter”, 36; AMIT, *Hidden Polemics*, 133-139; Eadem, “When Did Jerusalem Become a Subject of Polemic?”, *Jerusalem in Bible and Archaeol-*

Two of the Abraham narratives indirectly allude to the city, however. The first is Abraham's encounter with Malki-zedek, king of Salem (cf. Ps 76,3; 110,4), a priest of the Most High God who blessed Abraham, receiving from him in return a tenth of his wealth (Gen 14,18-20). The second is the story of the binding of Isaac, the *Akedah*, a typical *hieros logos* for a site where the first patriarch plays a major role. The story ends with a theophany, the founding of an altar, and the naming of the site "Adonai-yireh" ("the LORD will see"; Gen 22,1-14)<sup>67</sup>. The closing aetiology vaguely hints at Jerusalem: "Whence the present saying, 'On the mount of the LORD there is vision'" (Gen 22,14b; cf. Isa 2,3: "let us go up to the Mount of the LORD, to the House of the God of Jacob"). While these hints may reflect the tradition that Jerusalem's sanctity is due to its association with Abraham, they also testify to the city's excision from these accounts. Salem is connected to Shechem as well (Gen 33,18), and the story of Isaac's binding is a mutilated *hieros logos* lacking its goal — the explicit mention of the anchor site on which such stories hinge. Thus, there is no clear, explicit reference to Jerusalem in these early foundational stories, which set the stage for other major cultic sites in the land.

Jerusalem's nonexistence in the Pentateuch and early cultic and historical foundation tales is frequently explained as the product of an authentic historical sensitivity to and awareness of the fact that the city remained non-Israelite until David made it the capital of the "United Monarchy"<sup>68</sup>. The remnants of the founding sanctifying traditions (Genesis 14; 22), and traditions concerning its capture during the settlement period (Joshua 10;

ogy. The First Temple Period (eds. A.G. VAUGHN – A.E. KILLEBREW) (SBLSymSeries 18) (Atlanta, GA 2003) 365-374. Amit suggests a different solution from that proposed below — namely, that the absence of Jerusalem from stories of the nation's beginnings forms part of a polemic against the city's unique status due to its historical fate in the wake of the Babylonian destruction. SKA, "Why Does the Pentateuch Speak so Much of Torah", reaches a similar conclusion, comparing Jerusalem to the northern capital Samaria, destroyed by the Assyrians, and the religious center Shiloh — both also absent from Pentateuchal traditions.

<sup>67</sup> SEELIGMANN, "Aetiological Elements", 161; I. KALIMI, "Zion or Gerizim? The Association of Abraham and the 'Aqeda' with Zion/Gerizim in Jewish and Samaritan Sources", *Boundaries of the Ancient Near Eastern World. A Tribute to Cyrus H. Gordon* (eds. M. LUBETSKI – C. GOTTLIEB – S. KELLER) (Sheffield 1998) 442-457. For similar stories, cf. Beth-el (Gen 28,10-22) and Peniel (Gen 32,25-31). Although H. GUNKEL, *Genesis* (trans. M.E. BIDDLE) (Macon, GA 1997 [1901]) 237-238, identifies Genesis 22 as a typical *hieros logos*, he believed it originally referred to Jeruel/Jeriel in the region of Tekoa (2Chr 20,16.20), the association with Jerusalem arise due to the similarity between the names Jeriel and Ariel (cf. Isa 29,1.2.7).

<sup>68</sup> See, for example, J.H. HAYES, "The Traditions of Zion's Inviolability", *JBL* 82 (1963) 419-426, here 419; S. JAPHET, "From the King's Sanctuary to the Chosen City", *Judaism* 46 (1997) 132-139. For other scholars who adopt this approach, see AMIT, *Hidden Polemics*, 133-134.

Judges 1), however, suggest that the name of the city was actually expunged as part of a deliberately late historiographical and ideological strategy designed to demonstrate Jerusalem's uniqueness and preeminence over against all the other Israelite cities. In similar manner, the account of God's choice of David (1Samuel 16, where the root *bḥr* occurs three times in vv. 8-10) stresses the fact that he is selected despite his youth. As "the place where the LORD will choose to establish His name", Jerusalem's selection parallels God's choice of David and His promise of an everlasting monarchy to his dynasty (see Ps 132,11-14) <sup>69</sup>.

This link between Jerusalem and David fostered the extant form of the literary biblical tradition in Samuel that relates the account of the pestilence in the days of David and the purchase of Araunah's threshing floor, where David built an altar and sacrificed to God (2Sam 24,11-25). Just as, in the Deuteronomistic historical sequence, the narrative of David's capture of Jerusalem constitutes the final act in conquering the land, so here the halting of the plague and David's purchase of Araunah the Jebusite's threshing floor serves as the final foundational story of the greatest sacred site in the Bible, recounting God's appearance to an early founding figure, a miraculous act of deliverance, and the erection of an altar.

## VII. THE ACCOUNT OF THE CONQUEST OF JERUSALEM AND ITS SANCTIFICATION IN CHRONICLES

A comparison of earlier biblical references with the references to Jerusalem in Chronicles, and the way in which the Chronicler treats the traditions relating to the conquest, reveals that the city's representation as the final stronghold to be captured represents a deliberate historio-ideological choice rather than a historically-accurate account. The Chronicler accepts both the story of Jerusalem's conquest from the Jebusites (1Chr 11,4-6) and the city's consecration during David's reign (1Chr 21,9 – 22,1). As is indicated by the fact that a fourth of all the references to the city occur in Chronicles, the status of Jerusalem forms one of the book's central concerns. <sup>70</sup>

<sup>69</sup> The designation, "the place where the Lord will choose to establish His name", appears, with slight variations, twenty times in the Book of Deuteronomy, six in Deuteronomy 12 wherein God commands the centralization of the cult (12,5,11,14,18,21,26).

<sup>70</sup> P.C. BEENTJES, "Jerusalem in the Book of Chronicles", *The Centrality of Jerusalem. Historical Perspectives* (eds. M. POORTHUIS – C. SAFRAI) (Kampen 1996) 15-28, here 17; G.N. KNOPPERS, "'The City YHWH Has Chosen': The Chronicler's Promotion of Jerusalem in Light of Recent Archaeology", *Jerusalem in Bible and Archaeology. The First*

In keeping with the central role Jerusalem plays, the Chronicler portrays Solomon's building of the Temple in language that clearly alludes to the tradition of the *aqeda* "on one of the mountains" "in the land of Moriah" (Gen 22,2), and also associates the building with Araunah's (called Ornan in Chronicles) threshing floor: "Then Solomon began to build the House of the LORD in Jerusalem on Mount Moriah, where [the LORD] had appeared to his father David, at the place which David had designated, at the threshing floor of Ornan the Jebusite" (2Chr 3,1). The identification of the site of the Temple as "Mount Moriah" combines Gen 22,2 and 22,14 (God's order to Abraham to take Isaac to "the land of Moriah" and the name Abraham gives the site: "on the Mount of the LORD there is vision"). The Chronicler had no reservations about Jerusalem's early sacred status; since, for him, Jerusalem was the only legitimate religious centre and the location of the Temple, a mere allusion was sufficient, and so he had no need to set the city apart from other sites.

The story of Jerusalem's sanctification thus serves in Chronicles as the narrative of the sanctity of a unique place<sup>71</sup>. The origin traditions refer to four sites bought for payment from non-Israelite owners, all capital cities: Hebron (Gen 23,12) and Jerusalem (2Sam 24,21-24) in Judah; Shechem (Gen 33,19) and Samaria (2 Kgs 16,24) in Israel<sup>72</sup>. The purchase of Ornan the Jebusite's threshing floor at full cost (1Chr 29,22-26) is the only such story that Chronicles retains. It is thus clear that Jerusalem's status as the eternal capital and sacred center of the nation as a whole differs from that of the other capital cities, which only served parts of the people.

Even the account of David's conquest of Jerusalem is unique in the book. The Chronicler consistently ignores the narratives of the settlement of the land, on the grounds that the Israelites were indigenous to it<sup>73</sup>. The only conquest story he leaves in is that of Jerusalem. In place of the formulation in Samuel — "The king and his men marched to Jerusalem

Temple Period (eds. A.G. VAUGHN – A.E. KILLEBREW) (SBLSymSeries 18; Atlanta, GA 2003) 307-326.

<sup>71</sup> The Chronicler ignores the ritual centres that existed at other places, such as Dan and Beth-el: cf. 2Chr 13,4-12 (see KNOPPERS, "The City YHWH Has Chosen", 317 n. 41). God also revealed Himself at Gibeon to Solomon, who sacrificed to Him there (2Chr 1,6-7), and the sanctity of this site derives from the fact that it had temporarily housed the Tabernacle and the bronze altar (vv. 3,5); see S. JAPHET, *The Ideology of the Book of Chronicles and Its Place in Biblical Thought* (trans. A. BARBER) (Winona Lake, IN 2009) 171-172, 178-179.

<sup>72</sup> ZAKOVITCH, "The First Stages", 26-27.

<sup>73</sup> S. JAPHET, "Conquest and Settlement in Chronicles", *JBL* 98 (1979) 205-218.

against the Jebusites, the inhabitants of the land" (2Sam 5,6) — the Chronicler writes: "David and all Israel set out for Jerusalem, that is Jebus, where the Jebusite inhabitants of the land lived" (1Chr 11,4) <sup>74</sup>. The change to "all Israel" transforms the conquest into a national enterprise under David the unifier. Jerusalem's special status is thus also preserved by Chronicles, albeit somewhat differently from the patriarchal narratives and Samuel-Kings. Here, the city is portrayed as unique (in the land and in the history of the people), possessed of conquest and sanctification traditions that include David's purchase of the consecrated site within it at full cost; these traditions function to unite the name of the founder of the chosen royal dynasty and Jerusalem's status as his capital: "But then I chose Jerusalem for My name to abide there, and I chose David to rule My people Israel" (2Chr 6,6).

### VIII. CONCLUSION

My study has shown the importance of reevaluating the historical reliability of the story of David's conquest of Jerusalem, both by means of careful textual analysis and in light of the story's broader literary and historical context. Such a multifaceted analytical approach reveals that the conquest is represented as the final act in the settlement of Canaan. I have shown that the account of David's conquest of Jerusalem is a carefully constructed rhetorical creation, which stands out from all other biblical conquest accounts. The shapers of the account combined multiple traditions, highlighting and subsuming various elements to craft a tale of the establishment of Jerusalem as the capital of the "United Monarchy" in the days of David.

A parallel trajectory is evident in the traditional account of the city's establishment as a cultic center, which names David as the agent who purchased the holy site and built an altar there. Here, too, Jerusalem is the last place to be sanctified, and earlier traditions are dimmed and erased. Thus, these two narratives establish Jerusalem as the political capital and cultic center of the Israelite nation, as the culmination of the process of conquest.

We may say, then, that the biblical representation of Jerusalem's unique history supplies, first and foremost, not an account of the facts of conquest,

<sup>74</sup> S.L. MCKENZIE, *The Chronicler's Use of the Deuteronomistic History* (HSM 33; Atlanta, GA 1985) 41.

but a foundation for the city's importance as the Davidic capital. The association of its unique status with David is a sign, not of historicity, but of precisely the opposite — i.e., of myth in the service of a clear ideology.

The Hebrew University  
Jerusalem – Israel

Nili WAZANA

#### SUMMARY

The account of the conquest of Jerusalem from “the Jebusites who inhabited the region” (2Sam 5,6) should be understood historically in the context of the reconstruction of the beginnings of Israel in the land, like other biblical conquest traditions. At the same time, the literary uniqueness of this account reflects the ideological role of Jerusalem within the Deuteronomistic cycles — Jerusalem is like no other. The story of its conquest and establishment as the Israelite capital will be reconsidered here in light of the role played by the city in other conquest narratives, and in narratives of the foundation of holy sites.

## ISRAELS EXIL IN JUDA NACH DER URFASSUNG VON 1-2KÖNIGE

Die Königsbücher (1-2Könige) zeigen in der griechischen Textgestalt der Septuaginta (LXX) eine vielfach von der hebräisch-masoretischen Textgestalt (MT) abweichende Fassung. Textgeschichtliche Untersuchungen, insbesondere von A. Schenker, zeigen auf, dass MT die überarbeitete „Neuaufgabe“ einer früheren Edition von 1-2Könige darstellt, deren (hebräischer) Wortlaut nur noch in alten Übersetzungen erhalten geblieben ist<sup>1</sup>. Einen älteren Text bewahrt die LXX. Innerhalb der LXX hat die textgeschichtliche Forschung einen Traditionsstrang der sogenannten „lukianischen“ oder antiochenischen Handschriften (ANT) ermittelt, der für 2Sam 10,1 – 1Kön 2,11 und für 1Kön 22,1 – 2Kön 25,30 grundsätzlich die älteste Textgestalt repräsentiert<sup>2</sup>. Als weiterer Zeuge für die älteste (griechische) Textgestalt von 1-2Könige darf nach Schenker die — allerdings nur fragmentarisch erhaltene — altlateinische *Vetus Latina* (VL) gelten.

Meine Untersuchung setzt Schenkers textgeschichtliche Beweisführung voraus und baut auf ihr auf. Sie möchte mit literargeschichtlichen Argumenten zeigen, dass uns in der altlateinischen Handschrift L 115 der Zeuge einer frühen Textfassung der Königsbücher erhalten blieb, die beanspruchen darf, die Urfassung von 1-2Könige zu repräsentieren.

<sup>1</sup> A. SCHENKER, *Älteste Textgeschichte der Königsbücher*. Die hebräische Vorlage der ursprünglichen Septuaginta als älteste Textform der Königsbücher (OBO 199; Fribourg 2004); DERS., „La cause de la chute du Royaume d’Israël selon le Texte Massorétique et selon la Septante ancienne“, *Traduire la Bible Hébraïque*. De la Septante à la Nouvelle Bible Segond – *Translating the Hebrew Bible*. From the Septuagint to the Bible Segond (Hrsg. R. DAVID – M. JINBACHIAN) (Montréal 2005) 151-171; DERS., *Septante et texte massorétique dans l’histoire la plus ancienne du texte du 1 Rois 2–14* (Paris 2000). Widerspruch gegen Schenkers Thesen formulieren P.S.F. VAN KEULEN, *Two Versions of the Solomon Narrative* (VTS 104; Leiden 2005) und A.S. TURKANIK, *Of Kings and Reigns* (FAT 30; Tübingen 2008).

<sup>2</sup> N. FERNÁNDEZ MARCOS – J.R. BUSTO SAIZ (Hrsg.), *El Texto Antioqueno de la Biblia Griega* (TECC 50 y 53; Madrid 1989-1992). Zu ANT s. die Einleitung zu 1-4 Kgt in *Septuaginta Deutsch* (Hrsg. W. KRAUS – M. KARRER) (Stuttgart 2009) 300-301. Zu Abweichungen vom grundsätzlichen Vorrang von ANT vor den Handschriften der sogenannten „kaige-Rezension“ der LXX s. T.M. LAW – T. KAUHANEN, „Methodological Remarks on the Textual History of Reigns. A Response to Siegfried Kreuzer“, *BIOCS* 43 (2010) 75-89.



## I. L 115 UND 2KÖNIGE 17

Die Nationalbibliothek in Neapel bewahrt als cod. lat. 1 eine zweimal beschriebene Handschrift auf. Diesen Palimpsest hat B. Fischer unter dessen älterer Bezeichnung Palimpsestus Vindobonensis 17 und, nach seiner Ordnungszahl unter den Handschriften der VL, als L 115 vorgestellt und ausführlich beschrieben<sup>3</sup>. Nach paläographischem Urteil wurden um 700 Teile von älteren Manuskripten aus dem 5. Jh. zu einer Niederschrift grammatischer Traktate wiederverwendet und zusammengefasst. Außergewöhnlich ist L 115 unter anderem dadurch, dass sie die Nachricht vom Untergang des Staates Israel (2Könige 17) direkt nach 2Kön 15,38 einordnet und für 2Könige 17, außer Varianzen im Wortbestand, die Umstellung ganzer Textteile, Auslassungen und einen gänzlich unbekannten Bibeltext zeigt<sup>4</sup>. 2Könige 17 stellt sich nach L 115 folgendermaßen dar: V. 1-6 entspricht wesentlich dem ältesten ermittelbaren Textzeugnis Zeugnis<sup>5</sup>; es fehlt der ansonsten bekannte Synchronismus mit dem jüdischen König in V. 1. Nach V. 6 schließt L 115 (künftig vereinfacht auch: VL) eine singuläre Aussage an, die zu V. 15-19 überleitet. Darauf folgt V. 9, dessen Vers mit dem Ende der Manuskriptseite abbricht.

## II. EIN JUDA-KRITISCHES GESCHICHTSBILD

Die Kombination von 2Kön 17,19 mit V. 9 produziert in der altlateinischen Darstellung ein eigenes Geschichtsbild.

(19) *et iudas non observavit iustificationes domini dei sui sed ambulaverunt in actibus totius israel secundum quae fecerunt* (9) *et revelaverunt fili(i)s israel quae non ita oportebat ad deos suos et aedificaverunt sibi excel(...)*

(19) Und Juda bewahrte nicht die Gebote<sup>6</sup> des Herrn seines Gottes, sondern sie gingen im Treiben von ganz Israel, nach welchem sie taten. (9) Und sie enthüllten den Söhnen Israels, was sich so nicht gehört, zu ihren Göttern, und sie bauten sich Hö(hen ...)

<sup>3</sup> B. FISCHER, „Palimpsestus Vindobonensis: A Revised Edition of L 115 for Samuel-Kings“, *BIOSCS* 16 (1983) 13-87. Wiederabdruck in: DERS., *Beiträge zur Geschichte der lateinischen Bibeltexte* (Vetus Latina. Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel 12) (Freiburg 1986) 308-381.

<sup>4</sup> Zu 2Kön 17,1-6 s. SCHENKER, *Textgeschichte*, 116-119; zu 2Kön 17,7 – 19,9 s. DERS., „Cause“.

<sup>5</sup> P. TORIJANO MORALES, „Textual Criticism and the Text-Critical Edition of IV Regnorum: The Case of 17,2-6“, *After Qumran: Old and Modern Editions of the Biblical Texts — The Historical Books* (Hrsg. H. AUSLOOS – B. LEMMELIJN – J.C. TREBOLLE BARRERA) (Leuven 2012) 195-212.

<sup>6</sup> Auch in 1Sam 2,13 verwendet L 115 für griechisch δικάϊωμα (aber hebräisch מִשְׁפָּט) *iustificatio* als für VL typische Nebenform zu *mandatum*.

A. Schenker hebt hervor, dass VL in V. 19, anders als die griechische und masoretische Textüberlieferung, eine Identität des Treibens von Juda und Israel betont <sup>7</sup>. Sprechen MT und ANT nur von Judas Wandel in den „Satzungen“ (תקן/δικαιώματα), die Israel tat, so folgte nach VL Juda nicht nur dem „Treiben“ (*actus*, in 1Kön 16,28d für συμπλοκή) von ganz Israel, sondern sie taten auch selbst danach. Juda wird somit negativer als in den späteren Textüberlieferungen dargestellt. Die feine, aber doch erkennbare Abmilderung judäischer Schuld vor Gott in ANT/MT lässt fragen, wer der Schreiber der Vorlage von VL war. Er nahm eine erkennbar kritische Haltung zu Juda ein und bemaß das Land und seine Bevölkerung an genuin israelitischen Maßstäben (*actus totius Israel*).

In der Schriftprophetie, deren Zeugnis die Geschichte des Staates Juda über ein Jahrhundert begleitet, finden sich Aussagen, die zur Haltung von VL passen. So enthält die Hoseaschrift Worte, die aus einer israelitischen Sicht an Juda gerichtet sind. Ihr Grundton ist warnend und auch in solchen Passagen, deren genau gemeinte Sache für uns heute schwierig zu verstehen ist, doch erkennbar als eine der VL in 2Kön 17,19 vergleichbare Kritik zu lesen:

(4,15) Wenn du, Israel, herumhust, soll Juda sich nicht verschulden.

(5,5) [...] und Israel und Ephraim fallen über ihre Sünde, auch Juda ist gefallen mit ihnen.

(6,10) Im Haus Israel habe ich Schauderhaftes gesehen; dort ist für Ephraim Hurerei, Israel hat sich verunreinigt — (6,11) auch Juda — es ist angesetzt eine Ernte für dich; wenn ich das Geschick meines Volkes wende.

(10,11) [...] immer wieder wollte ich Ephraim anspannen, Juda sollte pflügen, Jakob für sich eggen. (10,12) Säet euch zur Gerechtigkeit, erntet gemäß Hingabe [...]

(12,1) Mit Lüge hat mich Ephraim umzingelt und mit Betrug das Haus Israel; und Juda geht noch mit El und ist treu mit Heiligen <sup>8</sup>.

Das Juda-kritische Bild wird von VL noch verschärft, wenn es an 2Kön 17,19 den V. 9 anschließt. Trotz weitreichender Wortäquivalente zu ANT und MT erhält der Vers eine gänzlich andere Ausrichtung. Anders als ANT/LXX/MT ein heimliches, verdecktes Handeln *Israels* ansprechen (ἡμφιάσαντο/ἡμφιέσαντο/אָפּהאַלן/[wörtlich:] an-/bekleiden [hier:

<sup>7</sup> „Le sens du TM et de la LXX suggère que les Israélites firent les normes ou lois, alors que la VL affirme l'identité des actes de Juda comme ceux d'Israël: 'ils marchaient dans les actes de *tout* Israël comme ils les faisaient'.“ (SCHENKER, „Cause“, 164).

<sup>8</sup> LXX: καὶ Ἰουδα νῦν ἔγνω αὐτοὺς ὁ θεὸς καὶ λαὸς ἅγιος κεκλήσεται θεοῦ zeigt eine interessante Verlesung des hebräischen Konsonantenbestandes. Doch bleibt rätselhaft, wer die „Heiligen“ (קדושים) sein sollen. War (trotz der Feststellung von 1Kön 15,12) ursprünglich eine Kritik „mit Kedeschen“ (עם־קדשים) formuliert?

von Worten]), spricht VL von einem öffentlichen „aufdecken, enthüllen“ (*revelaverunt*), das nun aber nicht von Israel, sondern von Juda (V. 19) ausgeht. Las Fischer buchstäblich in V. 9 *et revelaverunt filis israel* und deutete „*filis* = *filiis*: possibly an error for *fili*“, so widersprachen Trebolle Barrera und Schenker<sup>9</sup>. Der Dativ *filiis israel* bezeichnet die Israeliten als gelehrige Schüler der Judäer im Umgang mit „ihren Göttern“<sup>10</sup>. Die Fortsetzung *et aedificaverunt sibi excel* [...] dürfte allerdings eher „Israel“ als „Juda“ zum Subjekt haben<sup>11</sup>. Es ist weniger einsichtig, dass sich Judäer nach Unterrichtung der Israeliten neue oder erneut Höhenheiligtümer bauten. Wahrscheinlicher folgten die Israeliten den judäischen Anregungen und bauten ihrerseits Höhenheiligtümer. Diese Sicht von VL ermöglicht es, die Anklage Michas oder, wahrscheinlicher, die Anklage derer, die Michas Worte zum Anlass nahmen die Michaschrift zu verfassen, in denselben gesellschaftlichen Kontext zu stellen<sup>12</sup>:

(1,5) All dieses wegen der Frevel Jakobs und wegen der Sünden des Hauses Israel; wer ist der Frevel Jakobs? Etwa nicht Samaria? Und wer sind die Höhen Judas? Etwa nicht Jerusalem?

Ein alter exegetischer Streit um Mi 1,5 betrifft das Verhältnis beider, selbst jeweils zweigliedrigen Satzhälften zueinander. Bilden „Frevel Jakobs“ mit „Frevel Jakobs“ / „Samaria“ und „Sünden des Haus Israel“ mit „Höhen Judas“ / „Jerusalem“ je ein Paar, aber auch „Jakob – Haus Israel“ nach Mi 3,1.9 ein Paar, so ist anzunehmen — will man nicht eine vom Text nicht angezeigte Sinnänderung des Wortes „Israel“ unterstellen —, dass aus Sicht der Michaschrift das samarische „Haus Israel“ nun in Jerusalem residiert. VL 2Kön 17,9 unterstützt das von der Michaschrift gezeichnete Bild, es seien nach der assyrischen Eroberung Israels 722 v.Chr. Israeliten (*fili[i]s israel*) nach Juda geflohen und hätten dort im Land und in seinen Städten, namentlich Jerusalem und Lachisch Aufnahme gefunden<sup>13</sup>.

<sup>9</sup> FISCHER, „Palimpsestus“, 87; J.C. TREBOLLE BARRERA, „Recensión y redacción de 2 Re 17,7-23 (TM LXX<sup>B</sup> / LXX<sup>L</sup> VL)“, *Simposio Bíblico Español* (Hrsg. N. FERNÁNDEZ MARCOS) (Madrid 1984) 215-228, 219; SCHENKER, „Cause“, 166.

<sup>10</sup> SCHENKER, „Cause“, 166. Die scharfsinnige Analyse der Textgeschichte von J.C. TREBOLLE BARRERA, „Textual Pluralism and Composition of the Books of Kings. 2 Kings 17,2-23: MT, LXX<sup>B</sup>, LXX<sup>L</sup>, OL“, *After Qumran: Old and Modern Editions of the Biblical Texts – The Historical Books* (Hrsg. H. AUSLOOS – B. LEMMELIJN – J.C. TREBOLLE BARRERA) (Leuven 2012) 213-226, schießt hier, 217, exegetisch über die Textgrundlage der VL hinaus („The subject of the clause must be ‘the pagan nations’ (הַגִּיּוֹרִים)“).

<sup>11</sup> Vgl. den Subjektwechsel von Josafat hin zum Volk, nicht angezeigt in LXX 1Kön 16,28b und ausdrücklich angezeigt in der Parallele LXX 1Kön 22,44.

<sup>12</sup> Zur Michaschrift s. W. SCHÜTTE, *Israel's Exil in Juda*. Untersuchungen zur Entstehung der Schriftprophetie (OBO 279; Fribourg 2016) 84-99, 149-151.

<sup>13</sup> Vgl. Mi 1,9.13.

Um die These einer israelitischen Massenflucht nach Juda infolge der assyrischen Annexion Israels wird vor allem unter Archäologen, namentlich I. Finkelstein (*pro*) und N. Na'aman (*contra*), heftig gestritten <sup>14</sup>. Während diese These in Darstellungen der Geschichte Israels zunehmend Raum gewinnt, um die Aufnahme israelitischer Traditionen in der jüdischen Bibel zu erklären <sup>15</sup>, vermisste ich unter Alttestamentler(innen) eine entsprechende Diskussion, wie sich dieses Ereignis in den *biblischen* Zeugnissen niedergeschlagen haben könnte. Die Analyse der Handschrift L 115 setzt mein Bemühen fort, literargeschichtliche Argumente für Finkelsteins These zu finden <sup>16</sup>.

### III. DER „REST ISRAELS“

Die These von einem „Exil Israels in Juda“ wird von VL erneut gestützt, als sie 2Kön 17,19 diese Fassung von V. 18 vorausschickt:

(18) *et iratus est in indignatione dominus in reliquos israel ut transferret eos a faciem tuam non remansit nisi tribu iuda*

(18) und der Herr ist zornig geworden in Unwillen über die Übrigen Israels, dass er sie von deinem Angesicht hinüberschaffte, nichts verblieb außer dem Stamm Juda.

Während in V.18 *in indignatione* eine nur geringfügige Differenz zum griechischen und hebräischen Äquivalent („sehr“) darstellt <sup>17</sup>, bezeichnet *in reliquos israel* einen Teil Israels, die „Anderen“ oder „Übrigen“. Nach Schenker könnten die *reliqui* begrifflich dem hebräischen Ausdruck „Rest“ (שארית, denkbar ist ebenso יתר שאר, הנשארים) entsprechen <sup>18</sup>. Er hält drei Erklärungen für diese Wendung bereit: die „Übrigen“ sind die in Israel Überlebenden der assyrischen Annexionen infolge des syrisch-ephraimitischen Krieges 734/33 v.Chr. (2Kön 15,29) oder von 722 v.Chr.

<sup>14</sup> Zuletzt, mit einem guten Abriss der Vorgeschichte und Literatur, N. NA'AMAN, „Dismissing the Myth of a Flood of Israelite Refugees in the Late Eighth Century BCE“, ZAW 126 (2014) 1–14. Siehe auch I. FINKELSTEIN, „The Settlement History of Jerusalem in the Eighth and Seventh Centuries BC“, RB 115 (2008) 499–515.

<sup>15</sup> Noch vage M. GRANT, *Das heilige Land* (Bergisch Gladbach 1985) 184; deutlicher A. SCHOORS, *Die Königreiche Israel und Juda im 8. und 7. Jahrhundert v.Chr.* (BE(S) 5; Stuttgart 1998) 95; breit M. CLAUS, *Geschichte des Alten Israel* (München 2009) 63.

<sup>16</sup> So, in Auseinandersetzung mit einer These von K. WEINGART, *Stämmevolk – Staatsvolk – Gottesvolk?* (FAT 2.68; Tübingen 2014) zu „Israel“ und „Juda“, SCHÜTTE, *Exil*, 165–185.

<sup>17</sup> Vgl. SCHENKER, „Cause“, 163.

<sup>18</sup> Vgl. die Vulgata zu 2Kön 19,31; 21,14.

(2Kön 17,5-6); möglich wäre es auch, *reliqui israel* im Sinn von „ganz Israel“, abgesehen von Juda, zu verstehen<sup>19</sup>.

Die Nähe der Aussage zur Schilderung der assyrischen Deportation (2Kön 17,1-6) macht einen historischen Bezug zum Jahr 722 v.Chr. wahrscheinlich, zumal 2Kön 17,23 (ANT/MT) die Wendung bezeugt „bis dass der Herr / JHWH Israel von seinem Angesicht entfernte“. Fischer las in L 115 (V. 18) *a faciem tuam*, wobei er selbst einen Schreiberfehler statt „*a facie sua*“ vermutete<sup>20</sup>. Eine solche Korrektur an der Handschrift ist naheliegend, aber in Anbetracht der mehrfach beispiellosen Textüberlieferung nicht zwingend<sup>21</sup>. Welche unbekannte Person könnte hier angesprochen sein? Sie wäre, zweifellos von Juda aus, Zuschauer der Deportation der „Übriggebliebenen Israels“ geworden. Sachlich läge in „Israel“ das Verbindende zwischen den „Übriggebliebenen“ und der angeredeten Person. Tatsächlich gilt in der Schriftprophetie die Anrede in der 2. Pers. sg. mehrfach Israel in Juda<sup>22</sup>. Fehlende Parallelen in 1-2Könige lassen diese reizvolle Überlegung zu einem *a facie tua* im Ungewissen. Allenfalls Elemente wie „steht es nicht geschrieben [...]?“ und „bis auf den heutigen Tag“ deuten dialogische Strukturen in beiden Büchern an, die an die Leser gerichtet sind<sup>23</sup>.

Der Ausdruck *reliqui israel* weist, mit einer größeren Sicherheit, auf einen Aufenthalt von Israeliten in Juda, wenn man von 2Kön 17,18 zu V. 9 weiterliest. Während der „Rest Israels“ 722 v.Chr. aus den Augen Gottes verschwindet, enthüllt Juda den *fili[i]s israel*, was sich nicht gehört. Zweifellos sind diese Israeliten der Deportation entgangen und leben in Juda. Zwei biblische Beobachtungen ergänzen dieses Urteil. Wenn VL in 2Könige 17 von „Israel“ ab V. 9 sprachlich zu „Israeliten“ wechselt, um in Juda überlebende Israeliten vom „Rest Israels“ abzugrenzen, so entspricht diese Redeweise der Hoseaschrift. Hosea 4–14 spricht gewöhnlich von „Israel“ in einem deutlich nationalstaatlich-israelitisch geprägten Erzählszusammenhang und wechselt erst in einem erkennbar judäischen

<sup>19</sup> SCHENKER, „Cause“, 164.

<sup>20</sup> Dem folgt TREBOLLE BARRERA, „Recensión“, 228; vgl. 2Kön 17,20 ἀπὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ/מִפְנֵי; Schenker äußert sich dazu nicht. Doch verwirft SCHENKER, „Cause“, 160, 166, zwei andere von Fischer vermutete Schreiberfehler und unterstreicht damit eine Textgenauigkeit von VL in 2Könige 17.

<sup>21</sup> „Von seinem (= Gottes) Angesicht (verstoßen)“ in 1-2Könige (nur) 2Kön 17,18.20.23; 24,3.20; „von seinem Angesicht (nicht verstoßen)“ 2Kön<sup>MT</sup> 13,23 ist ein in ANT noch fehlender Text, welcher der Aussage von 2Kön 17,20 widerspricht. Es fällt auf, dass „verstoßen“ in 2Kön 17,18.23; 24,3 mit סָר, in 2Kön 13,23; 17,20; 24,20 mit שָׁלַךְ bezeichnet wird.

<sup>22</sup> Z.B. Mi 6,3-5.13-16 (vgl. SCHÜTTE, *Exil*, 90); Jer 4,1-2; Ez 7,6-9; s.a. Hos 13,4-5.9-11; 14,2 (vgl. SCHÜTTE, *Exil*, 83). Juda wird nie angesprochen!

<sup>23</sup> Z.B. 2Kön 16,19 (ANT) und 2Kön 17,6 (VL/ANT).

Erzählkontext zu „Israeliten“<sup>24</sup>. Wenn in der Schriftprophetie „Israel“ auch als Bezeichnung von Menschen in Juda dienen konnte, so bevorzugten es VL und Hosea gleichermaßen, die nach Juda geretteten „Kinder Israels“ von „Israel“ abzurücken.

Trotz der assyrischen Deportation des „Restes Israels“ werden erneut „Israeliten“ in Juda erwähnt. Daher ist es unwahrscheinlich, mit Schenker „ganz Israel, abgesehen von Juda“, als Bezugspunkt der *reliqui israel* verstehen. Das Verhältnis von Israel zum „Stamm Juda“ ist in VL 2Kön 17,18 unbestimmt gehalten als in griechischer und masoretischer Tradition, die beide ein „Juda allein“ (μονωτάτη/לבדו) hervorheben.

Unterschieden von den *fili[i]s israel* ist der Ausdruck *reliqui israel* aber noch in einer weiteren Hinsicht bemerkenswert. Die Kennzeichnung der nach Assyrien Deportierten als „Rest“ ist biblisch singulär. Bezeichnet „Rest“ (שאר, שארית) allgemein die Überlebenden einer Katastrophe oder das „Übriggebliebene“ von einem Teil (יתר), so bezeichnet der „Rest *Israels*“ in allen Fällen Überlebende der Katastrophe von 597 v.Chr.! Jeremia und Ezechiel zeigen auf, dass diese biblischen Begriffe eine theologische Entwicklung durchliefen. Die wohl ältesten Belege reden noch von einem „Rest Israels“, der in Jerusalem die Plünderung der Stadt überstehen konnte<sup>25</sup>. Doch schon Jer 6,9 kündigt ein Gericht über diesen „Rest“ an, der fortan auch nur noch ohne die Attribuierung „Israel“ erwähnt wird; er wird verstoßen und „in alle Winde zerstreut“<sup>26</sup>. Den „wahren“ Rest Israels weiß die biblische Überlieferung, entgegen der ursprünglichen Wortbedeutung, in der babylonischen Deportation geborgen (Jer 23,3). Von dort kehrt der „Rest (שארית) Israels“ wieder heim (Mi 2,12; 4,7) und wird zum Würdetitel der persischen Gemeinschaft in Juda (Zef 3,13), während für die in der Diaspora „Übriggebliebenen (יתר) Israels“ (Mi 5,2) eine Heimkehr noch erhofft wird<sup>27</sup>. Diese bis in die persische Zeit vollzogene theologische Sprachentwicklung dürfte dafür verantwortlich gewesen sein, dass der Begriff der *reliqui israel* als Bezeichnung für die nach Assyrien deportierten Israeliten in der weiteren Überlieferung von ANT/MT gelöscht wurde. Bereits auf der Redaktionsstufe von ANT verfielen die *reliqui israel* der assyrischen Deportation wie in der übrigen biblischen Überlieferung einer *damnatio memoriae*<sup>28</sup>.

<sup>24</sup> Hos 2,2; 3,1.4.5; 4,1.

<sup>25</sup> Jer 6,9; 9,8; 11,13.

<sup>26</sup> Ez 5,10; Jer 8,3; 15,9; 24,8-9.

<sup>27</sup> Ausführlich SCHÜTTE, *Exil*, 218-226.

<sup>28</sup> Vgl. Am 8,4-10, und SCHÜTTE, *Exil*, 55-56.

## IV. BEGRÜNDUNGEN DER DEPORTATION ISRAELS

Der Zorn des Gottes, der Israels Vorfahren aus Ägypten in das Land Israel geführt hatte und es nun aus diesem Land hatte deportieren lassen, wird von VL in 2Kön 17,15 und einem vorausgehenden selbständig formulierten Vers so begründet:

[...] *non custodierunt praecepta domini dei patrum suorum* (15) *et dereliquerunt legem eius et mandata eius quae disposuit patribus eorum et testimonia eius quibus testificatus est in eis et ambulaverunt post vana et evanuerunt et post gentes quae in circuitu eorum sunt de quibus preceperat dominus eis ne facerent secundum illa*

[...] sie bewahrten nicht die Gebote des Herrn, des Gottes ihrer Väter, (15) und verwarfen sein Gesetz und seine Satzungen, die er ihren Vätern gesetzt hat, und seine Verordnungen <sup>29</sup>, die er bezeugt hat bei ihnen, und sie wandelten hinter den Nichtigen, und sie wurden nichtig, und hinter den Völkern, die in ihrem Umkreis sind, von denen der Herr ihnen befohlen hatte, nicht nach jenen zu tun.

A. Schenker hebt den gewichtigsten Unterschied in der Überlieferung hervor <sup>30</sup>:

<i>et dereliquerunt</i>	καὶ ἀπόσαντο	וימאסו
<i>legem eius</i>	τὴν διαθήκην αὐτοῦ	את־הקיו
<i>et mandata eius ...</i>	καὶ τὰ δικαιώματα ...	ואת־בריתו ...
<i>et testimonia eius</i>	καὶ τὰ μαρτύρια αὐτοῦ	ואת עדותיו

Sprachlich weisen die Äquivalente מאס/ἀποθέομαι/*derelinquere* („verwerfen“) deutlich auf תורה/νόμος/*lex* als die semantisch ursprüngliche Wortwahl in 2Kön 17,15 <sup>31</sup>. Das Parallelglied *mandata* (VL)/δικαιώματα/חקים bzw. חקות ist durch Am 2,4; Jer 44,10 gesichert. Beide Stellen parallelisieren תורה/νόμος/*lex* mit חקים bzw. חקות/προστάγματα/*mandata*

<sup>29</sup> Ich interpretiere *praecepta* als מצות/ἐντολαί („Gebote“), *mandata* als חקים/δικαιώματα („Satzungen“) und *testimonia* als עדות/μαρτύρια („Verordnungen“).

<sup>30</sup> SCHENKER, „Cause“, 158-159.

<sup>31</sup> Vgl. Jes 5,24; Am 2,4; Jer 6,19 (alle mit *abicere* [VUL] verbunden); wenn MT die Reihenfolge der Objekte bei ANT zu חקיו / בריתו vertauscht, so erreicht MT eine semantisch stimmigere Zusammenstellung von Verb und Objekt (מאס חקים); Ez 5,6; 20,24). SCHENKER, „Cause“, 159, ist bemüht, für *disposuit* das Verb כרת als alten Wortbestand und unabhängig von dem strittigen ברית in 2Kön 17,15 zu sichern. Vom altlateinischen Text *legem eius et mandata eius quae disposuit* ausgehend bietet Ps 78,5 (תורה/νόμον ἔθετο/*legem posuit* [VUL]) jedoch eine bessere Option auf den anzunehmenden ursprünglichen hebräischen Wortlaut (שים; s.a. Ex 15,25) als Schenkers Hinweise auf eine Verbindung von כרת + דבר (Hag 2,5; Ps 105,8-9 = 1Chr 16,15-16) bzw. אמנה (Neh 10,1). Für Schenkers Gedanke spricht jedoch die Verbwahl in VL 2Kön 23,3 (*disposuit testamentum*) bei LUCIFER VON CAGLIARI, *Luciferi Calaritani opera quae supersunt. De non parcendo* VII (Hrsg. G.F. DIERCKS) (CCSL 8, Turnhout 1978) 207.



bzw. *praecepta* (Vulgata = VUL), wobei *προστάγματα* in 1-2Könige die ältere Wortwahl an Stelle von *δικαιώματα* repräsentiert<sup>32</sup>. Wenn Ps 78,5 *תורה/νόμος/lex* (VUL) mit *עדות/μαρτύριον/contestatio* (VUL) parallelisiert, dürfte damit das dritte Glied in 2Kön 17,15 (*עדות/μαρτύρια/testimonia* [VL]) bestätigt sein. Zwar findet sich mit Ps 25,10 auch ein Beispiel neben MT 2Kön 17,15, das *ברית/διαθήκη/testamentum* (VUL) mit *עדות/μαρτύρια/testimonia* (VUL) parallelisiert<sup>33</sup>. 1Kön 11,11 und 19,10.14 unterstreichen aber die Absicht des masoretischen Textes, in seiner Tradition von 1-2Könige die Rolle des „Bundes“ (*ברית*) aufzuwerten. In 1Kön 11,11 wird *αἱ ἐντολαί* gegen *ברית* ausgetauscht: *ולא שמרת בריתי וחקתי אשר צויתי* statt *καὶ οὐκ ἐφύλαξας τὰς ἐντολάς μου καὶ τὰ προστάγματά μου ἃ ἐνετείλαμην*<sup>34</sup>. In 1Kön 19,10 ersetzt MT ein „sie haben dich verlassen“ (*ἐγκατέλιπόν σε*, LXX/ANT) durch „sie haben deinen Bund verlassen“ (*עזבו בריתך*). Dasselbe ist vermutlich in 1Kön 19,14 geschehen, auch wenn die Fassung ohne „Bund“ nur der hier grundsätzlich jüngere ANT und nicht LXX bezeugt. Auch die Berufung auf den „Bund“ in 2Kön 13,23 bildet eine späte masoretische Textergänzung, die noch in ANT fehlt.

Fragt man nach der Bedeutung, die der Vorwurf der VL, die „Torah verworfen“ zu haben, in der Geschichte Israels und Judas hatte, so lässt die ältere Schriftprophetie deutlich einen heftigen Streit um die Torah erkennen. „Bund“ und „Torah“ gehören zwar zusammen, wie ein Vorwurf in Hos 8,1 betont („sie haben meinen Bund übertreten und gegen meine Torah rebelliert“). Doch heben der juda-exilische Völkerspruch über Juda (Am 2,4) und die Rahmung um die Jesaja-Denkschrift (Jes 5,8-30; 9,7 – 10,4) in Jes 5,24 hervor, dass in Juda lebende Menschen die „Torah JHWHs verworfen“ haben (*מאסו את תורת יהוה*)<sup>35</sup>. Die Jesaja-Denkschrift (Jesaja 6–8) schließt mit dem Appell „zur Torah und zur Bezeugung!“ (*לתורה ולתעודה*, Jes 8,20). Das Volk will die Torah nicht hören (Jes 1,10; 30,9). In Jerusalem tun Priester der „Torah Gewalt“ an (*חמסו תורה*, Zef 3,4). Wegen solcher Gewalt wird die „Torah kraftlos“ (*עליכן תפוג תורה*, Hab 1,3-4). Alle diese Aussagen gehören in das Juda des 7. Jh. v.Chr.<sup>36</sup> und werden

<sup>32</sup> Vgl. *δικαιώματα* in 2Kön 23,3 (LXX) und *προστάγματα* in 2 Kön 23,3 (ANT) par. 2Chr 34,31.

<sup>33</sup> Für 2Kön 17,15 nicht relevant sind die Parallelisierungen von *ברית/διαθήκη/pactum* bzw. *foedus* (VUL) mit *תורה/νόμος/lex* (VUL) in Hos 8,1; Jer 31,33.

<sup>34</sup> *שמר/φύλαττω* („bewahren“) steht in 1-2Könige niemals mit „Bund“ (*ברית/διαθήκη*) (doch Ez 17,14), wohl aber mit *δικαιώματα, προστάγματα* bzw. *מצות/ἐντολαί* (1Kön 2,3; 3,14; 11,38; 2Kön 17,13; 23,3).

<sup>35</sup> Über eine Zeit in Israel spricht Hos 4,6 mit einem personalisierten Vorwurf „du hast die Torah deines Gottes vergessen (*שכח*)“.

<sup>36</sup> Zu Am 2,4 und Jes 8,20 vgl. SCHÜTTE, *Exil*, 37-38, 158-159.

von Jeremia breit bestätigt<sup>37</sup>. Auch Jer 6,19 kann die Wendung von VL 2Kön 17,15 aufgreifen: „dieses Volk“ (nicht identisch mit „meinem Volk“ [Jer 6,14]) „hat meine Torah verworfen“ (ותורתי וימאסרבה). Aus der Sicht Ezechiels in Babylonien berührt die Torahfrage ebenfalls Jerusalemer Probleme. Dieselben Vorwürfe sind erkennbar: „ihre Priester tun meiner Torah Gewalt an“ (כהניה חמסו תורתי) (Ez 22,26), so dass sie zugrunde geht (תורה תאבד מכה) (Ez 7,26)<sup>38</sup>.

Es ist eine Sache, dass VL in 2Könige 17 die von Jeremia und Ezechiel gegen eine Gruppe gerichteten Vorwürfe — die in Jes 8,20 mit einem ebenfalls gruppenspezifischen Appell verbunden sind — auf der Linie von Am 2,4, Jes 5,24 verallgemeinert und sie dabei für die Deportation der *reliqui israel* verantwortlich macht. Es ist eine andere Sache, dass VL damit ein nach Ausweis der Schriftprophetie deutlich *judäisches* Thema aufgreift, das so nur in den letzten Jahrzehnten vor dem Ende des judäischen Staates (586 v.Chr.) virulent war und, nach Ausweis des MT, in der späteren Geschichtsbetrachtung vom Ende Israels seine Bedeutung verlor. Fragt man, wie und warum ein genuin judäisches Thema des 7. Jh. v.Chr. die Schuldursache für die Deportation Israels im 8. Jh. v.Chr. hat werden können, so bieten Jeremia und Ezechiel eine Erklärung. Beide Bücher sprechen, anders als Hosea, Amos, Micha und Jesaja, nicht nur Israeliten an, sondern wissen um Israeliten und Judäer als unterschiedene Entitäten in Juda und im babylonischen Exil<sup>39</sup>. Jeremia kreiert zudem einen „politisch korrekten“ Oberbegriff, um beide Ethnien oder Landsmannschaften gemeinsam anzusprechen: *איש יהודה* / „Mann Judas“<sup>40</sup>. Ist um 600 v.Chr. zweifelsfrei eine Koexistenz von Israeliten und Judäer in Juda gegeben, und richten sich Jeremia und Ezechiel in der Hauptsache an Israeliten (wie dies Hosea, Amos, Micha und Jesaja *ausschließlich* tun), so verweist VL in 2Könige 17 die Nachkommen der nach Juda geflohenen Israeliten auf ein Thema, das bis in die frühe babylonische Exilszeit heiß umstritten war, und erklärt den Gesetzesungehorsam zur Ursache für die assyrische Deportation eines Teils des israelitischen Volkes, der *reliqui israel*. Unbeschadet der Frage, ob oder wie sehr bereits in Israel zur Zeit Hoseas ein Streit um die Torah herrschte (Hos 4,6; 8,1), dürfte VL

<sup>37</sup> Dem Priester obliegt die Torah (Jer 18,18), aber er „kennt sie nicht“ (Jer 2,8; vgl. 8,8). Das Volk hat die Torah „verlassen“ (עזבו, Jer 9,12) statt nach ihr zu leben (Jer 26,4 [LXX: „Toroth“]; s.a. Jer 44,10 [nicht in LXX].23). Schon die Väter hatten die Torah nicht „bewahrt“ (שמרו, Jer 16,11).

<sup>38</sup> Unberücksichtigt bleiben hier historisch sicher späte Aussagen zur Torah: Jer 31,33 sowie aus Ezechiel 40–48, Haggai, Sacharja und Maleachi.

<sup>39</sup> Jer 5,11; 11,10.17; 13,11; 32,30.32; 50,4.33; Ez 4,4–6; 8,1; 14,1; 20,1.

<sup>40</sup> Vgl. insbesondere Jer 11,2–5; 32,32; und SCHÜTTE, *Exil*, 195–203.

auf dem Hintergrund des judäischen Streites in 2Könige 17 literarisch — zumindest auch — mit dem Argument des historischen Präzedenzfalls gearbeitet haben, um implizit Position zu jenem Disput zu beziehen.

## V. GESETZ, GEBOT UND BUND

G. Braulik hat 1970 die Ausdrücke für „Gesetz“ im Buch Deuteronomium untersucht<sup>41</sup>. Eine rechtssystematische Differenzierung der verschiedenen Begriffe gelang ihm nur sehr bedingt, da „die ursprünglichen Bedeutungsgrenzen der einzelnen Ausdrücke für ‘Gesetz’“ weitgehend aufgelöst seien und „die Entwicklung der einzelnen Wörter für ‘Gesetz’ in der dtr Tradition außerhalb des Dtn untersucht werden“ müsste<sup>42</sup>. Die von L 115 ermöglichten textgeschichtlichen Einsichten können einer in die Tiefe gehenden, historischen Forschung das Feld eröffnen.

Es wurde bereits deutlich, dass sich der Begriff „Bund“ in 1-2Könige erst recht spät ausbreitete<sup>43</sup>. Wie fremd VL der Ausdruck „Bund“ ist, unterstreicht erneut 2Kön 17,16.

(16) *et transierunt omnes praeceptum domini dei sui et fecerunt sibi fusilia duos vitulos et fecerunt lucos et adoraverunt toto exercitui caeli et servierunt illi baal*

(16) und alle übertraten das *praeceptum* des Herrn, ihres Gottes, und machten sich Gussbilder, zwei Kälber, und machten Haine und beteten das ganze Heer des Himmels an und dienten jenem Baal.

A. Schenker weist darauf hin, dass das von ANT/MT in V. 16 gewählte Verb „zurücklassen“ (ἐγκαταλείπω/עזב) nicht VL (*transire*) entspricht. Als Äquivalent zur VL ist παραβαίνω, παρέρχομαι/עבר zu erwarten, wie es als Ausdruck für den „Bundesbruch“ belegt ist<sup>44</sup>. Doch „Bund“ (ברית) kann nicht das Äquivalent für *praeceptum* sein, denn VL verwendet auch den Plural *praecepta* im singulären Vorsatz zu 2Kön 17,15. VL kennt *praecepta*, *mandata*, *testimonia* und *iustificationes* als Nomina im Plural, im Singular außer jenem *praeceptum* nur *lex*. In 17,7-23 bieten

<sup>41</sup> G. BRAULIK, „Die Ausdrücke für ‘Gesetz’ im Buch Deuteronomium“, *Bib* 51 (1970) 39-66, Wiederabdruck in: DERS., *Studien zur Theologie des Deuteronomiums* (SBAB 2; Stuttgart 1988) 11-38.

<sup>42</sup> BRAULIK, „Ausdrücke“, 12 und 38.

<sup>43</sup> Ferner rechne ich „Bund“ in 2Kön 17,35.38 der Überarbeitung der Vorlage von L 115 durch ANT zu. Zu 2Kön 18,12; 23,2.3.21 vgl. meine Einschätzung zu 2Könige 18-25 in Kap. VI.

<sup>44</sup> Dtn 17,2; 2Kön 18,12; Hos 6,7; 8,1; Jer (LXX) 41,18; vgl. SCHENKER, „Cause“, 159.

ANT/MT im Singular nur „Gesetz/Torah“ in V. 13 und „Bund“ in V. 15. *Praecepta/praecipere* leiten sich in 17,15 mit seinem Vorsatz zweifelsfrei vom hebräischen „befehlen“ (צוה) her, so dass *praeceptum* in 17,16 mit „Gebot“ (מצוה) zu übersetzen ist. Wie schon der spätere Ersatz von *lex* durch „Bund“ (ברית) in 17,15 anzeigte, muss VL textgeschichtlich in eine Zeit reichen, in welcher der Begriff des „Bundes“ seine große biblische Bedeutung noch nicht erlangt hatte. „Gesetz“ und „Gebot“ besitzen in L 115 ein besonderes Gepräge. Darauf soll in der erfordernten Kürze hingewiesen werden.

*Lex* steht in 2Kön 17,15 zwar vor *mandata* und *testimonia*, doch werden alle Bezeichnungen unter *precepta domini* zusammengefasst. Nicht wie sonst in 1-2Könige wird der Schriftwerkcharakter der *lex* als „Buch“ hervorgehoben noch Mose als ihr Urheber<sup>45</sup>. In 2Kön 10,31 tradiert L 115 anstelle der in 1-2Könige einmaligen Wendung „(im) Gesetz JHWHs (gehen)“ gar den gebräuchlicheren, ursprünglichen Ausdruck „*ire in viam domini*“. Hier wird textgeschichtlich erkennbar, dass das „Gesetz“ ab einer bestimmten Zeit als anerkanntes, kodifiziertes Werk *anstelle*<sup>46</sup> der Berufung auf eine traditionsgebundene Lebensführung trat, die sich JHWH verpflichtet wusste, ohne bestimmte Regelwerke hervorzuheben. Daher folgert Braulik verkehrt, der „Weg“ (דרך) bezeichne im Deuteronomium „den Dekalog und das gesamte mosaische ‘Gesetz’“<sup>47</sup>. Rechtsgeschichtlich wahrscheinlicher unternimmt es das Deuteronomium, eine traditionsbewusste Lebensführung, „den Weg JHWHs“, präziser auf den Dekalog und das kodifizierte dtn. Gesetz festzulegen (Dtn 5,33). Das Deuteronomium selbst verwendet den Begriff „Gesetz“ (תורה) nur in seinen Rahmenteilern, um die in Dtn 5–26 eingeschlossenen Rechtssammlungen, letztlich aber auch das ganze Buch rechtssystematisch als ein umfassendes „Gesetz des Mose“ zu definieren<sup>48</sup>. Ein solches, verschiedene Rechtsformen einendes „Gesetz“-werk lässt die *lex* (VL), eingeordnet in eine Aufzählung von „Geboten“ (*precepta*), noch nicht erkennen. Was im Text von L 115 näher mit „Gesetz“ gemeint ist, lässt sich nicht beschreiben. Es hat aber unter den „Geboten“ einen prominenten Rang. VL 2Kön 17,15 kennzeichnet das „Gesetz“ als *Gottes* Gesetz, was auch ANT in 2Kön 17,34.37 beibehält, als es das Kapitel neu formuliert. Entspricht VL der schriftprophetischen

<sup>45</sup> „Buch des Gesetzes“: 2Kön 14,6; 22,8.11; 23,24. „Gesetz des Mose“: 1Kön 2,3; 2Kön 14,6; 21,8; 23,25.

<sup>46</sup> Wie BRAULIK, „Ausdrücke“, 21, betont, steht „Weg“ (דרך) im Deuteronomium nie neben anderen Gesetzesbegriffen.

<sup>47</sup> BRAULIK, „Ausdrücke“, 23.

<sup>48</sup> Vgl. BRAULIK, „Ausdrücke“, 36–38; zu den Ausnahmen in Dtn 17,11.18.19 seine Anm. 115 und 116.

Rede von „meinem Gesetz“ zum Ende des jüdischen Reiches, so könnte ANT jedoch schon die spätere Vorstellung eines kodifizierten „Gesetzes JHWHs“ voraussetzen<sup>49</sup>.

Die Beziehung zwischen „Gesetz“ und „Gebot(e)“ bedarf einer eingehenden Untersuchung, die auch textgeschichtliche Befunde berücksichtigt. Innerhalb des Deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerks steht, von einer wörtlichen Übersetzung abweichend, in Dtn 17,17 LXX „Gebote“ (τὰς ἐντολάς) für MT „Worte des Gesetzes“ (דְּבַרֵּי הַתּוֹרָה). In 2Kön 21,8 steht für das „Gesetz, das Mose geboten hat“ (MT הַתּוֹרָה אֲשֶׁר צִוָּה מֹשֶׁה) im griechischen Mehrheitstext der LXX die *figura ethymologica* „das Gebot, das Mose geboten hat“ (τὴν ἐντολὴν ἣν ἐνετείλατο Μωϋσῆς)<sup>50</sup>. Ein ähnlicher Fall in 2Chr 30,16 lässt vermuten, dass „das Gesetz“ ab einer gewissen Zeit terminologisch „das Gebot“ ersetzen konnte<sup>51</sup>.

Eine Parallele für das Übertreten des „Gebotes“ (VL 2Kön 17,16 *transierunt praeceptum*) findet sich in Dtn 17,20 (סֹרֶר/παράβη ἀπὸ τῶν ἐντολῶν). „Der Singular findet sich in den Büchern Genesis bis Numeri nur einmal (Ex 24,12), im Dtn hingegen vierzehnmal [...] und geht [im Dtn] keine Reihenbildung mit anderen Wörtern für ‘Gesetz’ ein“<sup>52</sup>. LXX übersetzt „Gebot“ jeweils pluralisch, ausgenommen in Dtn 30,11, wo „das Gebot“ die Summe der „Gebote und Satzungen, die in diesem Buch des Gesetzes geschrieben sind“ (Dtn 30,10) bezeichnet. Die griechische Übersetzung des Pentateuch verdeckt damit zu ihrer Zeit die Möglichkeit, „das Gebot“ (הַמִּצְוָה) als Kollektivbegriff für eine Rechtssammlung neben dem des „Gesetzes“ zu erkennen. So vertritt VL 2Kön 17,16 mit *transierunt omnes praeceptum* eine alte Textform, wenn sie von „dem Gebot“ spricht<sup>53</sup>. Inhaltlich, wenn damit Israel anklagt wird, sich zwei Kälber gemacht und so das erste Gebot des Dekalogs verletzt zu haben, entspricht diese Übertretung des „Gebotes“ (*praeceptum*) jedoch

<sup>49</sup> Jer 6,19; 9,12; 16,11; Ez 22,26. Zum kodifizierten „Gesetz JHWHs“ vgl. etwa 1Chr 16,40; 2Chr 17,9.

<sup>50</sup> ANT tradiert jedoch wie MT „das Gesetz“.

<sup>51</sup> LXX und VL 2Chr 30,16 sprechen vom „Gebot Mose“ (τὴν ἐντολὴν Μωϋσῆ/mandatum Moysi), MT vom „Gesetz Mose“ (תּוֹרַת מֹשֶׁה). S.a. 2Chr. 12,1 (MT und VL: „Gesetz JHWHs“/LXX: „Gebote des Herrn“).

<sup>52</sup> BRAULIK, „Ausdrücke“, 26: Dtn 5,31; 6,1.25; 7,11; 8,1; 11,8.22; 15,5; 17,20; 19,9; 26,13; 27,1; 30,11; 31,5; davon seien Dtn 5,31; 6,1; 7,11 unechte Reihungen. In Ex 24,12 heißen „die Steintafeln“ „Gesetz und Gebot (LXX: Gebote)“, während Deuteronomium sechsmal den Dekalog als „Gebote“ bezeichnet (Dtn 5,10.29; 6,17; 7,9; 8,2; 13,5). Ansonsten bezeichne der Begriff „Gebote“ das ganze Gesetz Mose (vgl. BRAULIK, „Ausdrücke“, 28–32).

<sup>53</sup> ANT/MT ändern in diesem Vers neben dem Verb („übertreten“ [*transire*] gegen „zurücklassen“ [ἐγκαταλείπω/עֲזַב]) auch „Gebot“ (*praeceptum*) zu „(MT: alle) Gebote“ (כל־מִצְוֹת/ἐντολάς) ab.

dem später verbreiteten Vorwurf des gebrochenen „Bundes“. Entsprechend summiert eine zweite Notiz der assyrischen Deportation Israels in 2Kön 18,12 als Grund „weil sie nicht auf die Stimme JHWHs, ihres Gottes, gehört hatten, und sie übertraten (עבר/παραβαίνω = *transire*) den Bund, alles, was Mose geboten (צוה/ἐντέλλομαι) hatte“<sup>54</sup>. Wenn „Bund“ und „Gesetz“ zunehmend das „Gebot“ terminologisch verdrängen oder zumindest in die zweite Reihe drängen konnten, so dürfte dafür die von neuassyrischen Vorbildern geleitete formale Gestaltung des Deuteronomiums als Rechtstext ursächlich sein<sup>55</sup>. So formuliert die älteste, in Dtn 12,13 – 26,13\* enthaltene Rechtssammlung nach dem Zentralisierungsgebot, aber vor allen übrigen Rechtssatzungen eine Loyalitätsforderung Gottes an Israel (Dtn 13,2-12\*). Die Forderung ist Teil einer religiösen Polemik gegen die neuassyrische Loyalitätsforderung an die Vasallen (*adê*). Mit der von JHWH aufgestellten *adê* an Israel korrespondiert vorbildgerecht eine Reihe von Fluch- und Segensworten (Dtn 28,15.20-44\*), welche die Rechtskraft der Satzungen und dieses Bündnisses besiegeln soll. In babylon-exilischer Zeit wird das ursprünglich als direktes Gotteswort formulierte Gesetz neu gerahmt. Die dtn. Rechtssammlung, nunmehr als „Gesetz“ bezeichnet, gilt inzwischen als Inhalt eines von Mose vermittelten Bundes zwischen Gott und Israel. Mit Dtn 26,16-19 wird „die Bundestheologie ins Deuteronomium eingeführt“; die sogenannte „Bundesformel“ artikuliert den ehemals neuassyrischen Bundesgedanken des dtn. Rechtes kurz und knapp: JHWH und Israel binden sich gegenseitig<sup>56</sup>. Wie nun das kodifizierte „Gesetz“ in dtn.-dtr. Tradition terminologisch eine Berufung auf „das Gebot“ verdrängte, galt auch jede Verletzung des „Gesetzes“ als ein Brechen des „Bundes“. Aus der Formulierung von VL 2Kön 17,15-16 ist zu schließen, dass die unter der Sammelbezeichnung „Gebot“ (*praeceptum*) aufgezählten Ordnungen den mosaischen Bundesschluss noch nicht kannten.

Die Anfänge der von assyrischen Vorbildern motivierten dtn. Bundestheologie, die sich damit gegen assyrische Herrschafts- und Königsideologie wandte, wie auch der „Bundesformel“, die schriftprophetisch erstmals bei Jeremia und Ezechiel erscheint, sind im ausgehenden 7. Jh. v.Chr. zu suchen. Diese historische Bestimmung und die Textgeschichte von

<sup>54</sup> Vgl. 1Kön 11,11: Gott regiert auf Salomos Götzendienst in LXX kontextuell schlüssiger als MT „du hast nicht bewahrt meine Gebote (MT: Bund) und meine Satzungen, die ich dir geboten habe“.

<sup>55</sup> Die folgende Sicht auf das Deuteronomium schließt sich an die Darstellung von E. OTTO, *Das Gesetz des Mose* (Darmstadt 2007) 118-146 an.

<sup>56</sup> Zitat aus OTTO, *Gesetz*, 120; zu Dtn 26,17-19 als „Bundesformel“ s. R. RENDTORFF, *Die „Bundesformel“* (SBS 160; Stuttgart 1995) 29-30, 68-71.

1-2Könige lassen erkennen, dass die von mir abgehandelte dtn.-dtr. Begrifflichkeit erst zusammen mit einer grundlegenden Überarbeitung von 1-2Könige in diesem Werk Einzug hielt. In der ursprünglichen, hebräischen Vorlage von L 115 könnte ohne den dtn.-dtr. Begriff des „Bundes“ weder Salomo Gott an dessen „Bund und Treue“ erinnert haben (1Kön 8,23 vgl. Dtn 7,9), noch Jojada — unter Aufnahme der „Bundesformel“ — einen Bund zwischen JHWH, Joas und Volk schließen (2Kön 11,17). Schon grundsätzlich sind beide Darstellungen anachronistische Projektionen, die wie die Erwähnungen eines mosaischen Gesetzbuches zur Zeit Davids (1Kön 2,3) oder Amazjas (2Kön 14,6) allein der literarischen Fiktion genügen können, das unter Josia „wiederentdeckte“ Buch des Gesetzes (2Könige 22) sei früher bekannt gewesen. Nun kommt hinzu, dass auch die Vorlage von L 115 den Begriff des „Bundes“ — in VUL mit *foedus* oder *pactum* übersetzt — offenbar nicht kannte<sup>57</sup>. Ist die Buchfindungslegende von 2Könige 22–23 wie der Bundesschluss von Josia und seinem Volk mit JHWH (2Kön 23,3) zumindest nicht zwingend anachronistisch, muss 2Könige 22–23 dann als eine späte Zufügung zur Erstausgabe von 1-2Könige gelten? Bevor ich im nächsten Kapitel darauf antworten möchte, ist — da 2Könige 18–25 in L 115 nicht erhalten ist — auf das von MT abweichende, ältere Zeugnis von VL 2Kön 22,11 – 23,8 bei Lucifer von Cagliari hinzuweisen, dessen Darstellung von 2Kön 23,1-3 weiteren textgeschichtlichen Aufschluss über die literarisch fassbare Entstehungsgeschichte des „Gesetzes“ in 1-2Könige gibt, das in 2Kön 23,2 „Buch des Bundes“ genannt wird, in Anlehnung und Abgrenzung zum älteren „Buch des Bundes“ (Ex 22,22 – 23,33; 24,7)<sup>58</sup>.

## VI. WIE ENDETE VL 2KÖNIGE?

Die Textgestalt von VL 2Könige 17 spricht zahlreiche religiöse Missstände an, die ebenso jüdisch sind wie der Streit um die rechte Torah. So wirft VL Israel vor:

<sup>57</sup> L 115 spricht in 1Sam 4,3-5 viermal gegen ANT („Lade des Bundes JHWHs“) und mit den ältesten, durch Kodex Vaticanus repräsentierten Textzeugen nur von der *arca domini*!

<sup>58</sup> LUCIFER VON CAGLIARI, *De non parcendo* VII, 206-209. Dazu A. SCHENKER, „Die Textgeschichte der Königsbücher und ihre Konsequenz für die Textgeschichte der Hebräischen Bibel, illustriert am Beispiel von 2Kön 23,1-3“, *Congress Volume Leiden 2004* (ed. A. LEMAIRE) (VTS 109; Leiden 2006) 65-79; DERS., „Wer war gegen die Reform Joschijas? Neue historische Daten aus der Textgeschichte zu einem viel besprochenen Text: 2Kön 23,1-3“, *Damit sie das Leben haben (Joh 10,10)*. Festschrift für Walter Kirchschläger zum 60. Geburtstag (Hrsg. R. SCORALICK) (Zürich 2007) 247-253. S.a. T. KAUHANEN, „Lucifer of Cagliari and Literary Criticism in Kings“, *ZAW* 125 (2013) 418-432.



(16) *et fecerunt lucos et adoraverunt toto exercitui caeli et servierunt illi baal* (17) *et perducebant filios suos et filias suas in igni et divinabant divinationes et fecerunt ephod et theraphin et augurabantur et auspicabantur ut facerent quod malum est in conspectu domini ut in indignationem eum mitterent*

(16) und sie machten Haine und beteten das ganze Heer des Himmels an und dienten jenem Baal (17) und führten ihre Söhne und ihre Töchter durch das Feuer und weissagten Weissagungen und machten Ephod und Theraphim und Zeichenschau und Vogelschau, dass sie taten, was schlecht ist im Angesicht des Herrn, dass sie ihn zum Zorn reizten.

A. Schenker betont, dass gemäß Dtn 12,3 *luci* wie ἄλση bestimmte Kultobjekte benennen <sup>59</sup>. Der Vorwurf ihrer Verehrung in VL 2Kön 17,16 wird von ANT auch in 17,10 erhoben. Er ist nach 1Kön 14,23 bereits Rehabeam von Juda zu machen. Diese Verehrung bestand offenbar in Juda fort bis zur Zeit Hiskias (ANT 2Kön 18,4), wurde von Manasse erneuert (ANT 2Kön 21,3) und nach ANT 2Kön 23,14 erst von Josia endgültig beseitigt. Einzig ANT 2Kön 13,6 weiß von solchen Objekten in Samaria zu berichten <sup>60</sup>. Nimmt man die erst in ANT 2Kön 17,10 wie Dtn 12,3 miterwähnten Mazzeben zu den Vorwürfen auf, so gilt für Israel, dass Joram von Israel nach ANT 2Kön 3,2 die „Stelen des Baal“ ebenso entfernte wie später erneut Jehu (ANT 2Kön 10,26.27), hingegen Judas Mazzeben/Stelen bis zur Zeit Hiskias (ANT 2Kön 18,4) und, da Manasses Opferstätte für Baal offenbar eine solche Stele besaß, erneut noch bis unter Josia bestanden (ANT 2Kön 23,14). Das „ganze Heer des Himmels“ (*totus exercitus caeli*) steht nach 1Kön 22,19 zur Rechten und Linken JHWHs. Das Verbot seiner Verehrung (Dtn 4,19; 17,3) übertreten zu haben betrifft nur Manasse (2Kön 21,3.5); die Kultobjekte verbrannte Josia (23,4-5). Der Baalskult, ein Streitthema zur Zeit von Elia und Ahab (ANT 1Kön 16,32; 18), wird von Joram von Israel (ANT 2Kön 3,2) und von Jehu bekämpft (ANT 2Kön 10,18-28); in Juda pflegt Manasse den Baalskult (2Kön 21,3), bis er von Josia beseitigt wird (2Kön 23,4-5). Die heidnische Feuerprobe für die Kinder nach 2Kön 17,17 berichten 1-2Könige nur für Ahas und Manasse von Juda; Josia entweiht den Kultplatz <sup>61</sup>. Verschiedene Weisen der Divination unter Manasse kritisiert VL/ANT 2Kön 21,6 <sup>62</sup>. Schenker verweist zudem auf eine Lesart der VL 2Kön 23,4 bei Lucifer von Cagliari. So gab es zur Zeit von Josia noch den Titel der

<sup>59</sup> SCHENKER, „Cause“, 160.

<sup>60</sup> Ansonsten reden von ἄλσος (sg.) ANT 1Kön 16,42 (= MT 16,33; Verehrung unter Ahab); 2Kön 23,6.15 (Beseitigung durch Josia).

<sup>61</sup> 2Kön 16,3; 21,6; 23,10. S.a. 2Kön 17,31.

<sup>62</sup> Zur VL s. LUCIFER VON CAGLIARI, *Luciferi Calaritani opera quae supersunt. De regibus apostaticis VIII* (Hrsg. G.F. DIERCKS) (CCSL 8; Turnhout 1978) 153.

„Wächter des Ephod“ im Jerusalemer Tempel <sup>63</sup>. Ferner ist auf Josias Handeln in 2Kön 23,24 zu verweisen. Neben den Theraphim sind jene verjagten Totengeistbeschwörer und Wahrsager aufgezählt, vor denen der Kommentar zur Jesaja-Denkschrift warnt und fordert, „zur Torah und zur Bezeugung“ zu stehen (Jes 8,19-20) <sup>64</sup>.

Dieser Durchgang durch Bezüge von 1-2Könige zu den kultischen Verfehlungen nach VL 2Kön 17,16-17 zeigt, dass diese Verfehlungen, wenn sie denn Israel vorzuwerfen waren, vor allem nach 2Könige einem Israel *in Juda* in der Zeit von Ahas bis Josia vorzuwerfen waren. Wie sich schon bei der Untersuchung der Wendung „die Torah verwerfen“ zeigte, spiegeln die Vorwürfe, die angeblich zum Untergang des Staates Israel führten, Streitfragen vor allem des jüdischen 7. Jh. v.Chr. wider. In dieser Zielsetzung, Geschichte als Präzedenzfall zur Entscheidungsgrundlage für anstehende Fragen zu machen, zeigt sich das Anliegen und der Entstehungsgrund für 1-2Könige in seiner Urfassung. Diese Erkenntnis erklärt noch einmal die besonders Juda-kritische Haltung der VL in L 115.

Die Kultkritik von VL in 2Könige 17 bezieht das Treiben des Ahas in die Kritik an jüdischen Zuständen nach 722 v.Chr. ein. Man versteht auf dem Hintergrund des gerade Beschriebenen gut, wenn es ANT 2Kön 16,3 heißt:

Und Ahas wandelte auf dem Weg der Könige von Israel (LXX: auf dem Weg Jerobeams, des Sohnes Nabats, des Königs von Israel) und führte sogar seine Söhne (LXX: seinen Sohn) durch das Feuer entsprechend den Gräueln der Götter der Völker (LXX: den Gräueln der Völker), die der Herr vom Angesicht (LXX: vor dem Angesicht) der Israeliten <sup>65</sup> beseitigt hatte.

Dieser Vers unterstreicht die Anklage, die VL 2Kön 17,9 erhebt, kurz bevor der Text abbricht. Allerdings fehlt eine Notiz über Ahas' Herrschaft in L 115. Schenker weist darauf hin, dass diese Handschrift 2Kön 17,1 unmittelbar an 2Kön 15,38 anschließt <sup>66</sup>. Im Stil der Synchronisation der Könige von Israel und Juda, die in 1Kön 16,28a für VL belegt ist, müsste der Bericht über Ahas in VL daher zwangsläufig *nach* 2Könige 17 gekommen sein. Schenker begründet die heutige Textfolge mit einer Platzierung der Regentschaftszeit des Ahas vor dem Untergang Israels so, dass ein

<sup>63</sup> SCHENKER, „Cause“, 162-163, und LUCIFER VON CAGLIARI, *De non parcendo* VII, 207.

<sup>64</sup> Zur Bedeutung des Kommentars von Jes 8,19-20 für die von mir in die Zeit von Manasse oder Amon datierte Denkschrift vgl. SCHÜTTE, *Exil*, 153-159.

<sup>65</sup> Auch hier spricht ANT/LXX/MT wie in VL 2Kön 17,9 von „Kinder Israels/Israeliten“ statt von „Israel“; zum Ausdruck s.a. LXX 1Kön 14,24; 20,26; 2Kön 17,8; 21,2.9.

<sup>66</sup> (15,38) ... *et regnavit achas filius eius pro eo [= Joram] (17,1) et osee filius dala regnavit annis VIII in samariam.*

wegen Hiskias Reformen „frommes“ Juda aus Sicht der Redaktoren vor dem Gottesgericht bestehen konnte, dem Israel 722 v.Chr. verfiel <sup>67</sup>.

Tatsächlich ist die Chronologie zu Ahas und seiner 16 Jahre Regentschaft in MT nicht schlüssig; Angaben zu Pekach von Israel und Hiskia von Juda differieren. Jedoch sind mit dem syrisch-ephraimitischen Krieg 734-732 v.Chr., wo Ahas ein junger König war (Jesaja 7), und dem Feldzug von Sanherib gegen Jerusalem im Jahr 701 v.Chr., dem das Volk Hiskias, nach 2Kön 18,13 in Hiskias 14. Regentschaftsjahr, ausgesetzt war, zwei Eckpunkte gesetzt, die das Datum des Untergangs Israels 722 v.Chr. einrahmen. Tatsächlich füllen 16 Jahre Ahas und 14 Jahre Hiskia die Spanne vom syrisch-ephraimitischen Krieg 732 v.Chr. bis zu Sanheribs Erscheinen vor den Toren Jerusalems 701 v.Chr. recht gut, so dass mit großer Sicherheit Ahas die assyrische Eroberung Samarias von Jerusalem aus verfolgen konnte und er der erste jüdische Herrscher war, mit dem sich die israelitischen Flüchtlinge in Juda arrangieren mussten.

Wie endete 1-2Könige nach VL? Auch wenn es angesichts der Quellenlage von L 115 spekulativ ist, sprechen Indizien dafür, dass VL keine lange Fortsetzung kannte. Wenn VL 1-2Könige indirekt auf einen aktuellen Streit des 7. Jh. v.Chr. um die Torah eingeht, indem sie eine Fehlentscheidung Israels für den Untergang seines Staates verantwortlich macht, so dürften auch die von VL 2Kön 17,16-17 angeführten Gründe für diesen Untergang implizit Stellung zu gesellschaftlichen Fragen des jüdischen 7. Jh. v.Chr. nehmen. Die Zeitkritik, die VL 2Könige 17 erkennen lässt, und das Thema „Bund“, das erst durch 2Könige 22-23 literarisch verankert wird und der Textvorlage von L 115 — soweit erkennbar — noch völlig fehlt, sowie die lange Herrschaftsdauer von Manasse, die 55 Jahre währte, machen es unwahrscheinlich, dass die älteste Textform von 1-2Könige mit annalistischen Informationen zu einer späteren Zeit über 2Könige 17 hinausging. Einen handfesten Grund für diese Einschätzung gibt L 115 mit 2Kön 17,1. Der Handschrift fehlt nicht nur mit 2Könige 16 ein Bericht zu Ahas. 2Kön 17,1 fehlt zudem die Synchronisation des Hosea von Israel mit dem in Juda herrschenden König. Schenkers Einschätzung, 2Könige 16 hätte — entgegen dem durchgängigen Aufbauprinzip von 1-2Könige — tatsächlich erst nach 2 Könige 17 gestanden, fehlt jeder Anhalt. Man muss annehmen, dass 2Könige 16 und 18-25 einen späteren Nachtrag zu 2Könige bilden. Vermutlich aus politischer Klugheit schwieg sich die Urfassung von 1-2Könige über Ahas und seine Nachfolger aus.

<sup>67</sup> SCHENKER, *Textgeschichte*, 170.

## VII. ZUSAMMENFASSUNG

VL zeigt sich mit L 115 als ältester Textzeuge für 1-2Könige. Ihre Rede von den *reliqui israel* zeigt eine Form der Geschichtsdarstellung, die schon in persischer Zeit der schriftprophetischen Terminologie zuwiderlief. Die Stellung, die *lex* und *praeceptum*, „Gesetz“ und „Gebot“, in der theologischen Systematik in VL einnehmen, sowie deren Unkenntnis vom theologischen Topos des „Bundes“ legen eine zumindest babylon-exilische Abfassung der hebräischen Vorlage von L 115 nahe. Wenn es die schriftstellerische Absicht von VL 2Könige 17 war, implizit Zeitkritik an dem Juda des 7. Jh. v.Chr. zu üben und damit Position in aktuellen Streitfragen zu beziehen, die hinsichtlich der Torah erst mit dem Untergang des Staates Juda (586 v.Chr.) endeten, so liegt uns in L 115 eine sehr alte Textform vor. Deren hebräische Originalvorlage dürfte eine Erstausgabe von 1-2Könige gewesen sein, die zu Beginn des babylonischen Exils bereits vorlag. Sie berücksichtigte explizit vermutlich nur die Geschichte Israels (und Judas) bis 722 v.Chr. (2Könige 17) und sparte die Zeit der jüdischen Könige während des „israelitischen Exils in Juda“ nach 722 v.Chr. aus.

Zu allen Streitfragen, die Politik und Gesellschaft in Juda bis 586 v.Chr. bewegten, formuliert VL eine dezidiert israelitische Position, die vor allem Nachkommen der 722 v.Chr. geflüchteten Israeliten bewegen sollte, sich zu einem gesellschaftspolitischen Verhalten zu entscheiden, das religiös durch eine traditionsbewusste, allein auf JHWH ausgerichtete Theologie geleitet war, die dem Deuteronomium und der dtr. Theologie den Weg bereitete <sup>68</sup>.

Geschw. Scholl Str. 16  
D – 42897 Remscheid

Wolfgang SCHÜTTE

## SUMMARY

The Old Latin manuscript L 115 is considered in this article as representing the oldest (pre-exilic) form of 1-2 Kings and this for reasons based on its content. In this version, 2 Kings 17 takes a critical stand with respect to the religious situation of the Israelites in the land of Judah where they had fled after the fall of Samaria in 722 BCE.

<sup>68</sup> Zu zusätzlichen Argumenten für einen „exil-israelitischen“ Ursprung von 1-2Könige s. SCHÜTTE, *Exil*, 165-173.

## BRETHREN OR STRANGERS? SAMARITANS IN THE EYES OF SECOND-CENTURY B.C.E. JEWS

Current scholarship takes the view that the second century B.C.E. is the formative period for Samaritan identity, the period when the Samaritans definitely emerged as a self-contained community separate from the Jews<sup>1</sup>. Various factors are usually regarded either as the causes, or as the indicators of the completion of this gradual process. In particular, there is great importance placed on the production of the Samaritan Pentateuch<sup>2</sup>, the destruction of the Gerizim temple at the hand of the Hasmonean ruler John Hyrcanus (c. 112/111 B.C.E.)<sup>3</sup>, and the appearance of a distinct Samaritan dialect as “a linguistic marker of Samaritan identity”<sup>4</sup>. It has been stressed that numerous second-century B.C.E. Jewish works also display a negative attitude toward the Samaritans<sup>5</sup>. Evidence for this polemic has been found, for instance, in Ben Sira (50,25-26), the *Testament of Levi* (5–8), the *Book of Jubilees* (30), the *Book of Judith* (9,2-4) and others. These writings would thus give further reflection of the growing rift between the two groups that was eventually to result in the total estrangement of the Samaritans from the Jews.

<sup>1</sup> See S. SCHORCH, “The origin of the Samaritan community”, *LOSP* 7 (2005) 7-16, here 10; I. HJELM, “What Do Samaritans and Jews Have in Common? Recent Trends in Samaritan Studies”, *CBR* 3 (2004) 9-62, here 29. Others have proposed later dates for the parting of the ways between Jews and Samaritans; see A.D. CROWN, “Redating the Schism between the Judaeans and the Samaritans”, *JQR* 86 (1991) 17-50; J.D. MACCHI, *Les Samaritains. Histoire d'une légende. Israël et la province de Samarie* (Le monde de la Bible 30; Genève 1994) 42.

<sup>2</sup> See for instance J.D. PURVIS, “The Samaritan Problem: A Case Study in Jewish Sectarianism in the Roman Era”, *Tradition in Transformation. Turning Points in Biblical Faith* (eds. B. HALPERN – J.D. LEVENSON) (Winona Lake, IN 1981) 323-350, here 333.

<sup>3</sup> See among others F.M. CROSS, Jr., “Aspects of Samaritan and Jewish History in Late Persian and Hellenistic Times”, *HTR* 59 (1966) 201-211, here 210-211; PURVIS, “Problem”, 348-349; M. MOR, “The Persian, Hellenistic and Hasmonean Period”, *The Samaritans* (ed. A.D. CROWN) (Tübingen 1989) 1-18, here 18.

<sup>4</sup> See S. SCHORCH, “The Construction of Samari(t)an Identity from the Inside and from the Outside”, *Between Cooperation and Hostility. Multiple Identities in Ancient Judaism and the Interaction with Foreign Powers* (eds. R. ALBERTZ – J. WÖHRLE) (JAJ 11; Göttingen 2013) 135-149, here 137-138.

<sup>5</sup> In this respect, M. KARTVEIT, *The Origin of the Samaritans* (VTS 128; Leiden 2009) 352, has stated: “because they [the Samaritans] drew such heavy criticism from Jerusalem in the second century B.C.E., we also know that they were important in the eyes of the community there”.

In this paper, I propose to reconsider the supposed evidence for Jewish anti-Samaritan polemics in the second century B.C.E. included in Jewish literary sources. On the basis of this analysis and the examination of further contemporaneous sources (like the Second Book of the Maccabees and writings of Theodotus and [Pseudo-?]Eupolemus), I shall attempt to give an outline of how the Jews understood the Samaritans at this time <sup>6</sup>, in order to determine whether the latter were already perceived as a well-defined alien group. Thus, this study should provide new insights into the process that gave shape to the formation of Samaritan identity and the state of the relations between Jews and Samaritans in the second century B.C.E.

# I. THE EVIDENCE PUT FORWARD FOR ANTI-SAMARITAN POLEMICS IN SECOND CENTURY B.C.E.

This section will discuss second-century B.C.E. Jewish works that are usually considered as displaying an anti-Samaritan attitude.

## 1. *Ben Sira* 50,25-26

The Book of Ben Sira is viewed by many as preserving the oldest clear testimony to Jewish hatred of Samaritans <sup>7</sup>. This work was written in Hebrew during the first quarter of the second century B.C.E., and was later translated into Greek sometime between the years 132-117 B.C.E. <sup>8</sup>. The basis for the discussion is found in Sir 50,25-26. The Hebrew version reads:

Two nations my soul detests, and the third is not even a people (הַשְּׁלִישִׁית)  
(אֵינָם עַם):

Those who live in Seir, and the Philistines, and the foolish nation that live in Shechem (וְגֵרֵי נֶבֶל הַדֶּרֶךְ בְּשֶׁכֶם) (NRSA).

<sup>6</sup> By Samaritans, I refer to the worshippers of YHWH whose cult is centered on Mount Gerizim and who defined themselves as Israelites (see below on the Samaritan inscriptions from Delos).

<sup>7</sup> H.G. KIPPENBERG, *Garizim und Synagoge*. Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zur samaritanischen Religion der aramäischen Periode (RVV 30; New York – Berlin 1971) 74; M. MARTILA, *Foreign Nations in the Wisdom of Ben Sira*. A Jewish Sage between Opposition and Assimilation (DCLS 13; Berlin – Boston, MA 2012) 210.

<sup>8</sup> See G. SAUER, *Jesus Sirach/Ben Sira* (ATD Apocryphen 1; Göttingen 2000) 22; M. GILBERT, “Methodological and Hermeneutical Trends in Modern Exegesis on the Book of Ben Sira”, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira*. Studies on Tradition, Redaction, and Theology (eds. A. PASSARO – G. BELLIA) (DCLS 1; Berlin – New York 2008) 1-20, here 7; N. CALDUCH-BENAGES, “The Hymn to the Creation (Sir 42:15-43:33): A Polemic Text?”, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira*, 119-138, here 133.

As it has long been pointed out <sup>9</sup>, there is a clear parallelism between these verses and the song of Moses (Deut 32,21), where God says:

They (Israel) have moved me to jealousy with that which is not God; they have provoked me to anger with their vanities: and I will move them to jealousy with those which are not a people (בְּלֹא עַם); I will provoke them to anger with a foolish nation (בְּגוֹי נָבֵל). (K/JV)

The likely origin of the interpretation of Deut 32,21 as referring to Shechem resides in an analogy with Gen 34,7 where Shechem, the rapist of Dinah, is said to have committed a “נבלה (an outrageous thing)” against Israel. A vast number of scholars have taken for granted that the “foolish people (גוי נבל)”, against who Ben Sira expressed his deepest contempt, were no other than the Samaritans <sup>10</sup>. This view derives from Josephus’ saying that at the time of Alexander the Great, Shechem was the metropolis of the Samaritans (*Ant* 11:340). Nonetheless, Peter Van der Horst and Reinhard Pummer have called for caution, warning that not every reference to Shechem in ancient texts has necessarily something to do with the Samaritans; and it may well be that the author was here referring to the “non-Samaritan inhabitants of Shechem” <sup>11</sup>. Among the latter, one may mention the “Sidonians in Shechem (τῶν ἐν Σικίμοις Σιδωνίων)” mentioned by Josephus (*Ant* 11:340-347; 12:257-264). In *Ant* 12:257-264, Josephus cites a missive to Antiochus Epiphanes IV whose authors claimed to be Sidonians in Shechem. The latter request not to be persecuted like Jews on the ground that they are of Sidonian stock and practice different customs; in addition, they request that the Temple on Mount Gerizim be dedicated to Zeus Hellenios. Josephus, who identifies these Sidonians with the Samaritans, presents this letter as illustrating the opportunism of the Samaritans <sup>12</sup>. These “Sidonians in Shechem” were more than likely

<sup>9</sup> See, for instance, R. SMEND, *Die Weisheit des Jesus Sirach Hebräisch und Deutsch. Mit einem hebräischen Glossar* (Berlin 1906) 491.

<sup>10</sup> See among others: J.D. PURVIS, “Ben Sira and the Foolish People of Shechem”, *JNES* 24 (1965) 88-94; P.W. SKEHAN – A.A. DiLELLA, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira: A New Translation with Notes* (AB 30; New York 1987) 558; KARTVEIT, *Origin*, 140-148; MARTILA, *Nations*, 206-215.

<sup>11</sup> P.W. VAN DER HORST, “Anti-Samaritan Propaganda in Early Judaism”, *Persuasion and Dissuasion in Early Christianity, Ancient Judaism and Hellenism* (eds. P.W. VAN DER HORST et al.) (CBET 33; Leuven 2003) 25-44, here 32; R. PUMMER, *The Samaritans in Flavius Josephus* (TSAJ 129; Tübingen 2009) 12; IDEM, *The Samaritans: A Profile* (Grand Rapids, MI 2016) 47-50.

<sup>12</sup> Many accept the genuineness of this document. See E. BICKERMANN, “Un document relatif à la persécution d’Antiochos IV Épiphane”, *RHR* 115 (1937) 188-223; B. ISAAC, “A Seleucid Inscription from Jamnia-on-the-Sea: Antiochus V Eupator and the Sidonians”, *IEJ* 41 (1991) 142-143; J. DUŠEK, *Aramaic and Hebrew Inscriptions from Mt. Gerizim and Samaria between Antiochus III and Antiochus IV Epiphanes* (CHANE 54; Leiden



members of a colony of Sidonians established in Shechem<sup>13</sup>. The existence of such colonies is attested in other cities of Hellenistic Palestine like Marisa and Jamnia-on-the-Sea<sup>14</sup>. It is not impossible that the “Sidonians in Shechem” had adopted to some extent the cult linked to the Temple on Mount Gerizim; in the same way, the Sidonians in Marisa seem to have worshipped the local Idumean god Kos<sup>15</sup>. Nonetheless, it is obvious that the self-identified “Sidonians in Shechem” are to be distinguished from the Samaritans (who defined themselves as Israelites). Furthermore, it is quite likely that other population groups lived in the areas, as Jan Dušek has suggested in light of the inscriptions from Mt. Gerizim bearing Greek and Arabic names<sup>16</sup>. The manifold ethnicity of Shechem and its surroundings should be taken into consideration when analyzing Sir 50,25-26. In this vein, it has been suggested that one of the reasons for calling the inhabitants of Shechem a non-people derives from their being a mixed population<sup>17</sup>.

If, nonetheless, “the foolish people that live in Shechem” did mean, in the mind of the author(s) of Ben Sira, the Samaritans, because of their worshipping on Mount Gerizim<sup>18</sup>, then what was the significance and implication of calling them a “non-people”? According to many scholars, the Samaritans were not, in the view of Ben Sira, a discrete ethnic group like the Edomites (Seir) and the Philistine nations<sup>19</sup>. Matthew Goff, however, has considered that “grouping the foolish nation of Shechem with Seir and

2012) 103. For the opposite view, see U. RAPPAPORT, “The Samaritans in the Hellenistic Period”, *Zion* 55 (1990) 386-393 (Hebrew).

<sup>13</sup> See, for instance, ISAAC, “Inscription”, 142-143; DUŠEK, *Inscriptions*, 101-104. For the view that the Sidonians were Samaritans, see BICKERMANN, “Document”; MOR, “Persian”, 14-15.

<sup>14</sup> On the Sidonian colonies at Marisa, see E.D. OREN – U. RAPPAPORT, “The Necropolis of Maresha–Beth Govrin”, *IEJ* 34 (1984) 114-153.

<sup>15</sup> It is noteworthy that the divine name Kos appears in a number of theophoric names in the Sidonian tombs of Marisa. See J.P. PETERS *et al.*, *Painted Tombs in the Necropolis of Marissa (Marēshah)* (London 1905) 44-47, 54, 62-63.

<sup>16</sup> DUŠEK, *Inscriptions*, 104.

<sup>17</sup> E.J.C. TIGCHELAAR, *Prophets of Old and the Day of the End*. Zechariah, the Book of Watchers and Apocalyptic (OTS 35; Leiden – New York 1996) 202 n. 77.

<sup>18</sup> See, for instance, CROWN, “Redating the Schism”, 32 n. 56. Support for this view may be found in Midrash Tannaim to Deut 32,21 where “non-people” is interpreted referring to the Samaritans (“בלא עם אלו הכותים אקניאם”); D. HOFFMANN (ed.), *Midrasch Tannaim zum Deuteronomium* (Berlin 1909) 1:196.

<sup>19</sup> See, for instance, H.D. MANTEL, “The Secession of the Samaritans”, *Bar-Ilan* 7-8 (1970) 162-177, here 176 n. 86 (Hebrew); J. ZANGENBERG, *SAMAREIA*. Antike Quellen zur Geschichte und Kultur der Samaritaner in deutscher Übersetzung (TANZ 15; Tübingen – Basel 1994) 42; M. BÖHM, *Samarien und die Samaritai bei Lukas* (WUNT 2.111; Tübingen 1999) 155-157; O. MULDER, *Simon the High Priest in Sirach 50*. An Exegetical Study of the Significance of Simon the High Priest as Climax to the Praise of the Fathers in Ben Sira’s Concept of the History of Israel (JSJSup 78; Leiden 2003) 222.

Philistia suggests that Ben Sira considered its people to be Gentiles rather than heterodox Jews”<sup>20</sup>. Here, it is worth noting that the wording “foolish” also appears in Sir 49,5 in reference to the Babylonian conquerors of Jerusalem. Yet, there is a very significant difference between the two occurrences of this word: while the Shechemites are merely called a “foolish nation (גִּי נָבַל)”, the Babylonians are referred to as a “foolish foreign nation (גִּי נָבַל נָכְרִי; 49,5)”. It has been proposed that, far from being accidental, the use of the term נָבַל as referring both to the Shechemites and the Babylonians was aimed at establishing their common origins; this association would be consistent with Josephus’ treatment of the Samaritans as the offspring of the Mesopotamian Cutheans (*Ant* 9:288-291)<sup>21</sup>. Therefore, no really convincing explanation for the adding of נָכְרִי in Sir 49,5 (against Sir 50,26) has been provided. In my view, however, the difference between the two passages is more likely to indicate that, unlike the Babylonians, the Shechemites were not considered to be foreigners by Ben Sira. Furthermore, this proves that the expression גִּבְלִים was not exclusively used to designate the Shechemites in the original Hebrew text of Ben Sira.

The later Greek version (G) of Sir 50,25-26 is slightly different:

My soul was offended at two nations, and the third is not a nation (τὸ τρίτον οὐκ ἔστιν ἔθνος): those who settled on Mount Samaria (οἱ καθήμενοι ἐν ὄρει Σαμαρείας) and Phylistim, and the foolish people who live in Sikima (ὁ λαὸς ὁ μωρὸς ὁ κατοικῶν ἐν Σικιμοῖς)<sup>22</sup>.

What is so remarkable is that the expression “those who live on Mount Seir” has been replaced by “those who settled on Mount Samaria”. It has been suggested that this change was the result of a textual corruption in the Greek version<sup>23</sup>. Others have seen in this alteration a deliberate anti-Samaritan editing of the Hebrew text, reflecting the deterioration in Jewish-Samaritan relations in the course of the second century B.C.E.<sup>24</sup>. Thus,

<sup>20</sup> M. GOFF, “The Foolish Nation that Dwells in Shechem: Ben Sira on Shechem and Other Peoples in Palestine”, *The “Other” in Second Temple Judaism. Essays in Honor of John J. Collins* (eds. D.C. HARLOW *et al.*) (CICWLS; Grand Rapids, MI 2011) 173-188, here 176.

<sup>21</sup> See, for instance, R. HANHART, “Zu den ältesten Traditionen über das samaritanische Schisma”, *EI* 16 (1982) 106\*-115\*, here 107\*. It may be useful to recall here that *Ant* 9:288-291 constitutes the earliest testimony to the interpretation of 2 Kings 17 as referring to the origins of the Samaritans.

<sup>22</sup> Translation: A. PIETERSMA – B.G. WRIGHT (eds.), *A New English Translation of the Septuagint and the Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included under That Title* (Oxford – New York 2007) 761.

<sup>23</sup> SMEND, *Weisheit*, 491.

<sup>24</sup> See KARTVEIT, *Origin*, 143; GOFF, “Foolish”, 186; SCHORCH, “Construction”, 137; D. BARAG, “New Evidence on the Foreign Policy of John Hyrcanus I”, *INJ* 12 (1992/3) 1-12.

while the Idumeans (Seir) were regarded as full-fledged Jews following their conversion under John Hyrcanus, the Samaritans had become fully estranged from the Jewish community. This proposition is not without difficulties. Firstly, the results of the excavations at sites like Marisa, Tel Beer-Sheva and others indicate that John Hyrcanus' conquest of Idumea occurred between the years 112/111-108/107 B.C.E., that is after the accepted date for the translation of Ben Sira into Greek (between the years 132-117 B.C.E.). And secondly, this proposition requires assuming that Sir 50,25-26 (G) contains two contradictory references to the Samaritans, one reference as a "nation" and the second as a "non-nation". Thus it is clear that "those who settled on Mount Samaria" are to be distinguished from "the foolish people that live in Shechem". Pummer has stressed that ὄρει Σαμαρείας can refer either to the "Samaritan mountain", that is to the mountains in the area of Samaria in general, or to the mountain of the city of Samaria<sup>25</sup>. Interestingly enough, in 1 Kgs 16,24 "the mountain of Samaria (הר שִׁמְרֹן)" appears in reference to the site purchased by King Omri for the building of the Samaritan capital city<sup>26</sup>. Samaria was indeed located on the top of a high hill (c. 430 m above the sea level); before its conquest by John Hyrcanus, it was a strong Hellenistic city whose inhabitants were mostly the descendants of the original Macedonian settlers<sup>27</sup>. The capture of Samaria was undertaken by Aristobulus and Antigonos (John Hyrcanus' sons), who laid siege to the city for a year. Eventually, John Hyrcanus had Samaria flooded by diverting a river and utterly destroyed (ca. 108 B.C.E.; *Ant* 13:281<sup>28</sup>). As if to present this as an extraordinary case, Josephus stresses John Hyrcanus' loathing for the inhabitants of the city of Samaria whom he subsequently sold into slavery (*Ant*. 13:275). The great hostility shown toward the inhabitants of Samaria is likely to have been growing among the Jews during the years before the destruction of the city; given this, there is a good case that by "οἱ καθήμενοι ἐν ὄρει Σαμαρείας", the author of Ben Sira was targeting the dwellers of the city of Samaria.

As in the original Hebrew text, the reference to Shechem in Sir 50,25-26 (G) may also, but not certainly, echo a polemic against the Samaritans.

<sup>25</sup> Many scholars make a distinction between "Samaritans", i.e., the inhabitants of the district of Samaria in general, and the "Samaritans", i.e., the YHWH worshippers attached to mount Gerizim as the place of worship; see PUMMER, *Josephus*, 4-5.

<sup>26</sup> See also Amos 3,9; 4,1; 6,1.

<sup>27</sup> G.N. KNOPPERS, *Jews and Samaritans. The Origins and History of Their Early Relations* (Oxford 2013) 173.

<sup>28</sup> Although Josephus' report is certainly exaggerated, archaeological evidence does confirm the violent destruction of large parts of Samaria. See G.A. REISNER *et al.*, *Harvard excavations at Samaria 1908-1910* (Cambridge 1924) 50, 252-273.

In this respect, it is noteworthy that the late second-century B.C.E. Greek translator has rendered **עַם אֵיננו** by οὐκ ἔστιν ἔθνος (rather than οὐκ ἔστιν λαός<sup>29</sup>) and **בִּי גֵר נָבֵל** by ὁ λαός ὁ μωρός (rather than by τὸ ἔθνος τὸ μωρόν). Perhaps he merely sought to harmonize apparent inconsistencies by making clearer the opposition between those “who settled on Mount Samaria” and the “Philistim” who were nations, and the inhabitants of Shechem who were “not a nation”, the immediate implication being that the latter could not be called a “foolish nation” but rather a “foolish people”. The proposition could also be made that Sir 50,25-26 (G) actually reflects the translator’s understanding of the Samaritans (if indeed they are meant at all in this verse). It is noteworthy in this connection that in the Greek Ben Sira λαός refers almost exclusively (either explicitly or implicitly) to the people of Israel<sup>30</sup> whereas ἔθνος/ ἔθνη refers only to foreign nations<sup>31</sup>. Accordingly, one may wonder whether by calling them ὁ λαός ὁ μωρός the Greek translator sought to emphasize that, in spite of their foolishness, the people of Shechem retained their link to the people of Israel.

In conclusion, there is no certainty regarding the identity of the inhabitants of Shechem in Sir 50,25-26 (H and G): if the Samaritans are not meant here, then it could be that the Shechemites were called a non-people/nation because of their being a population of mixed ethnic origins. If, however, Sir 50,25-26 (H and G) does allude to the Samaritans, it indicates that in the view of the early second-century B.C.E. Hebrew writer of Ben Sira, and that of the late second-century B.C.E. Greek translator, the Samaritans were clearly to be distinguished from the Gentile nations, which would thus imply that they were still bound to the community of Israel in spite of their foolishness.

## 2. *The Narratives of Dinah’s Rape*

As we have seen, Sir 50,25-26 may include a reference to the story of the rape of Dinah. Interestingly enough, numerous writings from the second century B.C.E. retell this episode; these accounts are frequently mentioned in the discussions on the Jewish-Samaritan relations at this time. But before addressing them, we must turn our attention to the biblical narrative itself.

<sup>29</sup> In most cases, λαός stands for **עַם** in the Greek Ben Sira. See Sir 9,17; 10,1.2; 16,17; 31,9; 33,19; 35,23; 36,11.16; 37,23.26; 41,18; 45,9.15; 46,13; 48,15; 50,4.

<sup>30</sup> Sir 9,17; 10,1.2.3; 16,17; 24,1; 31,9; 33,19; 35,23; 36,8.11.13.16; 37,23.26; 38,33; 41,18; 44,4; 45,3.7.9.15.16.22.24.26; 46,7.13.20; 47,4.23; 48,15; 49,2.15; 50,4.17.19. The two exceptions are Sir 24,6; 44,15.

<sup>31</sup> Sir 4,15; 10,8; 16,6.9; 17,17; 28,14; 29,18; 35,20; 36,1.2; 39,10.23; 44,21; 46,6; 49,5; 50,25.

According to Genesis 34, Dinah, the daughter of Jacob and Leah, was raped by Shechem (the son of Hamor, the Hivite), eponym of the city by that name and “prince of the Land”. Shechem became very attached to her and expressed his willingness to marry her. At his request, Hamor, his father, carried on negotiations with Jacob and his sons asking that Dinah be given to Shechem in marriage; furthermore, he offered the Israelites the chance to intermarry with his people the Hivvites and to dwell among them in their land. Jacob’s sons answered him deceitfully by requesting that Hamor and all his countrymen be circumcised first, saying that under this condition only the Israelites and the Hivvites could become a single people. Hamor and Shechem accepted these terms and convinced their townsfolk to be circumcised. On the third day after the mass circumcision, though, two of Jacob’s sons, Simeon and Levi, took advantage of the weakened state of the Hivvites in order to slaughter them and release Dinah from Shechem’s house. Then, the other brothers joined them in sacking the city. However, these actions of his sons were severely criticized by Jacob who feared that the other Canaanites would take revenge and destroy his household; to this, Simeon and Levi replied by asking their father whether it was acceptable that Shechem should be allowed to treat their sister as a whore.

As noted above, this story has been the focus of many interpretations in the Hasmonean period; retellings of the Dinah episode can be found in the *Testament of Levi*, the *Book of Jubilees*, the *Book of Judith*, Theodotus, and *4QNarrative and Poetic Composition*. According to a widely-accepted view, the authors of these texts have adapted Genesis 34 for their own needs as propaganda against the Samaritans<sup>32</sup>; by reworking the story of Dinah’s rape, they sought to establish an identification between the wicked Shechemites of Genesis 34 and the people who dwelt in Shechem in their own time, i.e., supposedly the Samaritans. Although this proposition cannot be dismissed out of hand, it cannot serve as a general principle of interpretation and needs to be verified case by case. First, it should be stressed that the biblical account of the rape of Dinah has several features other than its geographical setting in Shechem, which may explain its popularity among second-century B.C.E. Jews. Indeed, it deals with a range of burning issues then prevalent, such as intermarriages with non-Jews, (compulsory) circumcision of pagans, and more generally the conversion of Gentiles to Judaism. Thus, for instance, it is conspicuous that the *Book*

<sup>32</sup> See, for instance, J.J. COLLINS, “The Epic of Theodotus and the Hellenism of the Hasmonians”, *HTR* 73 (1980) 91-104; D. MENDELS, *The Land of Israel as a Political Concept in Hasmonean Literature* (TSAJ 15; Tübingen 1987) 110.

of *Jubilees* (30) has used and adapted Dinah's story in order to condemn exogamous marriages and Gentiles' conversion to Judaism<sup>33</sup>; its author had probably in mind the conversion of the Idumeans under John Hyrcanus<sup>34</sup>. In this connection, Seth Schwartz has stressed *Jubilees*' "lack of interest in the Shechemites"<sup>35</sup>, its main concern being the Gentiles in general (*Jub* 30,7). Of particular importance is *Jubilees*' stating that the Shechemites/Hivvites remained uncircumcised until they were slain by Simeon and Levi (*Jub* 30,4). The reason for this is obvious: *Jubilees* rejects any possibility of their becoming Jewish. The depiction of the Shechemites from Jacob's time as permanently uncircumcised renders their identification with the Samaritans of the second century B.C.E. most difficult. Indeed, as Pummer has emphasized, we have no reason to believe that the latter had ceased to practice circumcision in the Hellenistic period<sup>36</sup>. If the actual intent of *Jubilees* was to trace the Samaritans to the heathen Shechem of Genesis 34, the mention of the circumcision of the Shechemites would have provided him with a convenient explanation for the Samaritans of his day practicing circumcision (in spite of their supposedly not being Israelites as descendant of the Hivvites). For the purpose of comparison, Josephus felt it necessary to explain under what circumstances the Samaritans (whom he treated as non-Israelites) came to "adopt" Israelite customs (*Ant* 9:288-291); he probably thought that, otherwise, the connection between the ancient Cutheans and the Samaritans of his own day would be less obvious. To conclude, the fact that *Jubilees* has depicted the Shechemites as permanently uncircumcised argues against the idea that he had in mind the Samaritans of his own day. This observation applies also to the other versions of Genesis 34, which fail to mention the circumcision of the people of Shechem before the attack of Simeon and Levi, such as the Book of Judith (9)<sup>37</sup>.

<sup>33</sup> See, *inter alia*, I. SHATZMAN, "Jews and Gentiles from Judas Maccabaeus to John Hyrcanus according to Contemporary Jewish Sources", *Studies in Josephus and the Varieties of Ancient Judaism*. Louis H. Feldman Jubilee Volume (eds. S.J.D. COHEN – J.J. SCHWARTZ) (AJEC 67; Leiden – Boston, MA 2007) 237-270, here 260; M. SEGAL, "Rewriting the Story of Dinah and Shechem: The Literary Development of *Jubilees* 30", *The Hebrew Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (eds. A. LANGE *et al.*) (FRLANT 239; Göttingen 2012) 337-356, here 349.

<sup>34</sup> S.J.D. COHEN, *The Beginnings of Jewishness*. Boundaries, Varieties, Uncertainties Hellenistic Culture and Society (HCS 31; Berkeley, CA 1999) 123.

<sup>35</sup> S. SCHWARTZ, "John Hyrcanus I's Destruction of the Gerizim Temple and Judean-Samaritan Relations", *JH* 7 (1993) 9-25, here 12.

<sup>36</sup> R. PUMMER, "Genesis 34 in Jewish Writings of the Hellenistic and Roman Periods", *HTR* 75 (1982) 177-188, here 185-186.

<sup>37</sup> S. SCHWARTZ, "Destruction", 13, has noted against the alleged anti-Samaritan thrust of the Book of Judith that the eponymous heroine of this writing, Judith, is depicted as living in northern Samaria.

What about the versions of Genesis 34 that do mention the circumcision of the Shechemites like the *Testament of Levi* (*T. Levi*)? In its present form, this work constitutes a section of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, a Christian document in Greek from the late second century C.E. However, the majority view holds that it is a Jewish text from the second century B.C.E., that was later subject to Christian additions<sup>38</sup>. The early work used by the Christian author was probably a Jewish *Levi* document related in some way to the Aramaic *Levi* fragments found among the Dead Sea scrolls and in the Cairo Geniza<sup>39</sup>. *T. Levi* narrates Levi's heavenly journey; it refers twice to the rape of Dinah: first briefly in chapter 2 and then at length in chapters 5–7. Its treatment of this story presents two important characteristics:

1. It explicitly states that the Shechemites were circumcised before they were slaughtered (*T. Levi* 6,6).
2. It establishes a direct connection between the Shechemites' past misdeeds and the city of Shechem of his own time, as it appears in Levi's speech to his father:

And I [Levi] said to father: Do not be angry, Lord, because through you the Lord will reduce the Canaanites to nothing, and He will give their land to you and your seed after you. For from this day on Shechem will be called a city of imbeciles (πόλις ἀσυνέτων); for as someone mocks a fool (μωρόν), so we mocked them; because also they had wrought folly (ἄφροσύνην) in Israel to defile our sister (*T. Levi* 7.1-3)<sup>40</sup>.

Like Sir 50,25-26, *T. Levi* seems to create an analogy between Deut 32,21 and Gen 34,7<sup>41</sup>. *T. Levi* 7 has often been regarded as testifying to the Jews' hostility toward the Samaritans in the second century B.C.E.<sup>42</sup>. But, however evident this statement may appear, it has a few drawbacks that cannot be overlooked. To begin with, one cannot be certain whether this

<sup>38</sup> See, for instance, J.H. CHARLESWORTH, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha and the New Testament. Prolegomena for the Study of Christian Origins* (MSSNTS 54; Cambridge, UK – New York 1985) 38-41.

<sup>39</sup> For the text of the Aramaic *Levi* Document, see J.C. GREENFIELD *et al.*, *The Aramaic Levi Document: Edition, Translation, Commentary* (SVTP 19; Leiden 2004) 56-109. On the relationship between Aramaic *Levi* and the Greek text of the *Testament of Levi*, see M. DEJONGE, "The Testament of Levi and 'Aramaic Levi'", *RevQ* 13 (1988) 367-385.

<sup>40</sup> Translation: J.L. KUGEL, *Traditions of the Bible. A Guide to the Bible as It Was at the Start of the Common Era* (Cambridge, MA 1998) 26.

<sup>41</sup> The LXX of Deut 32,21 uses ἀσύνετος for נָבִיל. Likewise, the term ἀφροσύνη is sometimes used to translate the word נָבִיל in the LXX (Deut 22,21; Judg 19,23,24; 20,6,10); it remains the case however that the LXX of Gen 34,7 does not use ἀφροσύνη but ἀσχήμων.

<sup>42</sup> See, for instance, COLLINS, "Theodotus", 98; J.L. KUGEL, "The Story of Dinah in the 'Testament of Levi'", *HTR* 85 (1992) 1-34, here 23-25.



passage belongs to the original Jewish strata of *T. Levi* or whether it is due to later editorial activity; in fact, no parallel to *T. Levi* 7,1-3 has been found in the Aramaic Levi's fragments<sup>43</sup>. Besides, as noted above, a reference to Shechem in ancient Jewish literature is not necessarily a reference to the Samaritans. Thus, in the absence of a clear identity marker (like a reference to Mount Gerizim), one cannot be certain whether the Samaritans were the people targeted by *T. Levi*. If the Samaritans are really meant in this passage, their treatment here turns out to be rather perplexing. Although, as we have seen, *T. Levi* links the Shechemites' past misdeeds to the city of Shechem of his own time, it does not genealogically trace the Samaritans to the ancient Shechemites. Indeed, Levi's speech to his father makes clear that, after its conquest, Shechem was not to be inhabited again by Canaanites but by Israel (7,1)<sup>44</sup>. Accordingly, *T. Levi* implies that the Samaritans were part of the people of Israel (although they are called fools).

### 3. *4QNarrative and Poetic Composition*

It has also been proposed that polemic against the Samaritans and the Gerizim temple is reflected in two manuscripts discovered at Qumran, namely 4Q371 and 4Q372. These fragments belong to a Hebrew text currently known as *4QNarrative and Poetic Composition*<sup>45</sup>. On the basis of paleographic analysis, 4Q371 has been dated to 100-75 B.C.E. and 4Q372 to ca. 50 B.C.E.<sup>46</sup>. Because of the fragmentary state of the manuscripts, the precise nature of the text as a whole remains opaque; our discussion, though, shall only focus on the portion that deals with the figure of Joseph. The first part of this section (4Q372 1, lines 1-15a) is of a narrative character. It opens with a poorly preserved account of the people of Israel's sins that led up to its overthrow and exile as divine punishment. Although both the catastrophes of 722 B.C.E. and 587 B.C.E. are referred to here, the enemies who take Israel into captivity are indistinctly designated as הַגִּיִּים (4Q372 1, lines 4; 5; 7). The first editor of the text, Eileen Schuller, has suggested that lines 8b-10 refer to the subsequent restoration of the tribes

<sup>43</sup> The Aramaic Levi Document contains a retelling of Genesis 34 (GREENFIELD *et al.*, *Aramaic Levi*, 56-59); but as KARTVEIT, *Origin*, 175, has noted, this account is too fragmentary "to say anything about a certain ideological tendency in this material".

<sup>44</sup> PUMMER, "Genesis 34", 183; KUGEL, "Dinah", 23.

<sup>45</sup> This work, formerly known as "Joseph Apocryphon" is contained in three more manuscripts (in addition to 4Q371 and 4Q372): 2Q22, 4Q373, and 4Q373a.

<sup>46</sup> E. SCHULLER, "4Q372 1: A Text about Joseph", *RevQ* 14 (1989-1990) 349-376, here 349.

of Judah, Benjamin and Levi, according to the deuteronomic scheme sin-exile-return<sup>47</sup>. The following lines, in which Joseph is first mentioned, are of direct interest to our discussion:

- 10b. And in all this, Joseph was cast into lands he did not k[now ]  
 11. among a foreign nation (בגוי נאכר) and dispersed in all the world. All their mountains were desolate of them [ w and fools were dwelling in their land (וונבלים ישבים בארצם)]  
 12. and making for themselves a high place upon a high mountain (במה על הר גבה) to provoke (להקניא) Israel to jealousy; and they spoke with wor[ds of ]  
 13. the sons of Jacob and they acted terribly with the words of their mouth to revile against the tent of Zion (לגדף על אהל ציון); and they spoke [... words of falsehood, and all]  
 14. words of deceit they spoke to provoke (להכעיס) Levi and Judah and Benjamin with their words. And in all this Joseph [was given]  
 15a. into the hands of foreigners (בני נאכר), who were devouring his strength and breaking all his bones until the time of the end for him<sup>48</sup>.

Unlike his brothers, Joseph remains in exile while new dwellers occupy his lands. There also follows a question concerning the latter in the second part of the composition, which consists of a prayer put in the mouth of Joseph (4Q372 1, lines 15b-32). Joseph cries out to God, begging Him to save him from the hands of the nations (הגוים); then, he refers to the present situation of his homeland:

- 19b. ... [They took]my land from me and from all my brothers who  
 20. are joined with me. A hostile people (עם אירב) is dwelling upon it and k.[.]p and they [the people] opened their mouth against  
 21. all the sons of your friend Jacob with vexations to l[ ]  
 22. the time (when) you will destroy them from the entire world, and they will give[ ]<sup>49</sup>

The prayer ends with Joseph's promising to do justice, to offer sacrifices, to praise God and to teach his Law to the sinners. Schuller has proposed an ingenious interpretation of the text<sup>50</sup>. In her opinion, Joseph is to be understood here not as the patriarch of Genesis, but as the northern tribes

<sup>47</sup> SCHULLER, "4Q372 1", 359.

<sup>48</sup> Translation: E. SCHULLER – M. BERNSTEIN, "372. 4QNarrative and Poetic Composition", *Wadi Daliyeh II: The Samaria Papyri from Wadi Daliyeh and Qumran Cave 4.XXVIII: Miscellanea*. Part 2 (eds. D.M. GROPP *et al.*) (DJD 28; Oxford 2001) 165-198, here 169.

<sup>49</sup> Translation: SCHULLER – BERNSTEIN, "4Qnarrative", 169-170.

<sup>50</sup> SCHULLER, "4Q372 1", 371.

of Israel which, unlike the southern tribes (i.e., the Judaeen community centered on Jerusalem), keep enduring exile from their homeland. Furthermore, and this is the main point of her proposal, the new occupants of Joseph's territory may be "the Jewish community around Shechem with its cultic centre at Mount Gerizim". One of her principal arguments is that the term נבלים ("fools"), by which the new dwellers are designated, was (as already said) used as a derogatory appellation for the Shechemites in other Jewish texts of the second century B.C.E. In this line, she sees in the setting up of a "high place (במה) on a high mountain" (l. 12) a probable reference to the building of a temple on Mount Gerizim. Further support for this hypothesis is derived from the fools speaking "against the tent of Zion" (l. 13), which is likely to reflect the dispute between Jerusalem and Gerizim worshippers about the appropriate location for worship. Schuller has concluded that 4Q372 was part of an anti-Samaritan work whose purpose was to refute the Samaritans' (or "proto-Samaritans"<sup>51</sup>) claim to be the offspring of Joseph, by stating that his genuine descendants were still in exile<sup>52</sup>; she believes that its composition antedates the destruction of the Gerizim Temple by John Hyrcanus I (ca. 112/111 B.C.E.). Although this theory has been largely accepted<sup>53</sup>, other interpretations have been proposed. Robert A. Kugler, for instance, has suggested that the polemic of the text was directed against the leadership of the Jerusalem sanctuary: the Qumran community, which was exiled from the temple, identified with the figure of Joseph as the idealized archetype of the exiled<sup>54</sup>. David C. Mitchell, for his part, believes that in 4Q372 Joseph is to be understood, not as a figure representing the exiled northern tribes, but as a messianic figure<sup>55</sup>. While Reinhard Pummer considers Schuller's hypothesis to be possible, he warns with Seth Schwartz that the attacks in 4Q372

<sup>51</sup> SCHULLER, "4Q372 1", 371 n. 35.

<sup>52</sup> The Samaritans' claim to be the descendants of the tribe of Joseph is reflected in Josephus, *Ant* 9:291; 11:341.

<sup>53</sup> See, for instance, M.A. KNIBB, "A Note on 4Q372 and 4Q390", *The Scriptures and the Scrolls*. Studies in Honour of A.S. van der Woude on the Occasion of his 65<sup>th</sup> Birthday (eds. F. GARCÍA MARTÍNEZ *et al.*) (VTS 49; Leiden 1992) 164-177, here 168; M. KARTVEIT, "Who Are the 'Fools' in 4QNarrative and Poetic Composition<sup>a-c</sup>", *Northern Lights on the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Proceedings of the Nordic Qumran Network 2003-2006 (eds. A. KLOSTERGAARD-PETERSEN *et al.*) (StDJ 80; Leiden 2009) 119-133. For a slightly different proposition, see M. THIESSEN, "4Q372 1 and the Continuation of Joseph's Exile", *DSD* 15 (2008) 380-395.

<sup>54</sup> R.A. KUGLER, "Joseph at Qumran: The Importance of 4Q372 1 in Extending a Tradition", *Studies in the Hebrew Bible, Qumran and the Septuagint Presented to Eugene Ulrich* (eds. P. FLINT *et al.*) (VTS 101; Leiden 2006) 261-278, here 276-277.

<sup>55</sup> D.C. MITCHELL, "A Dying and Rising Josephite Messiah in 4Q372", *JSP* 18 (2009) 181-205.

could also be directed against groups other than the Samaritans, such as “Shechemite reformers, or Greek colonists at Samaria, or no actual contemporary group at all”<sup>56</sup>. In this connection, we have already stressed that the term נבל was not exclusively used as a derogatory term against the Shechemites (an appellation which is in itself perplexing and does not necessarily refer to the Samaritans). There is, however, a good case that the sanctuary on Mount Gerizim is the intended reference to the high place built on a high mountain in the land of Joseph, and that the foolish people who speak against the tent of Zion are the Gerizim worshippers. Thus, this text could be said to reflect the tense relations between (part of the) YHWH worshippers in Jerusalem and (part of) those attached to Mount Gerizim in the second century B.C.E. As in Ben Sira 50,25-26, the use of נבלים in 4Q372 1 (line 11) derives most likely from the Song of Moses (Deut 32,21), which it may be helpful to quote here again:

They (Israel) have moved me to jealousy (קנאוני) with that which is not God; they have provoked me to anger (כעסוני) with their vanities: and I will move them to jealousy (אקניאם) with those which are not a people (בלא-עם); I will provoke them to anger (אכעיסם) with a foolish nation (בגוי נבל). (K/IV)

In contradistinction to *Ben Sira* and *T. Levi*, 4Q372 1 has not associated Deut 32,21 with Genesis 34; more generally, it is noteworthy that there is not here any explicit reference to Shechem, (either the biblical figure or the eponymous city)<sup>57</sup>. This should prompt us not to automatically regard polemics against Shechem and against the Samaritans in Jewish literature as intrinsically related issues. Besides, in keeping with Schuller, it appears that the author has portrayed the Gerizim worshippers as the foolish nation by means of which God makes Israel jealous (“להקניא”; 4Q372 1, line 12), and angers (“להכעיס”; line 14) Levi, Judah, and Benjamin. The parallel with Deut 32,21 is almost perfect; however, one element is conspicuously missing, i.e., the “non-people”. Furthermore, if, as it seems, 4Q372 1 lines 19-22 contains a second allusion to the fools, it is striking that in this passage, the latter are called “hostile people (עם אריב)”. This cannot be merely coincidental, and it is likely that the author has consciously altered the letter of Deut 32,21. Does this mean that the Gerizim worshippers were in his eyes, not an ill-defined mass of people (a “non-people”)

<sup>56</sup> S. SCHWARTZ, “Destruction”, 22 n. 18; PUMMER, *Josephus*, 20.

<sup>57</sup> J. ZSENGELLÉR, “Does Wisdom Come from the Temple”, *Studies in the Book of Ben Sira* (eds. G.G. XERAVITS – J. ZSENGELLÉR) (JSJSup 127; Leiden 2008) 135-149, here 147-149, has suggested that the reference to Joseph’s bones in 4Q372 1 (line 15) may allude to the site of Shechem where Joseph was buried according to Jos 24,32. However, the text refers to the nations breaking Joseph’s bones while he is in their hands in exile from his homeland.

like in Sir 50.25-26<sup>58</sup>, but rather a bounded and discrete entity? Answering this issue turns out to be rather complicated. Schuller has convincingly demonstrated that, from the author's perspective, the fools are to be distinguished from the authentic descendants of Joseph<sup>59</sup>. It is also essential to observe here that they are also differentiated from the "foreign nations". As already seen, the latter are not designated by specific names, but by general wording such as **הגרים** (l. 4; 5; 7; 16), **גוי נאכר** (l. 11), **בני נאכר** (l. 15), and are clearly depicted as a unit. Mladen Popović has argued that the distinction made in 4Q372 1 between the "nations (**הגרים**)" far away and the "hostile people (**עם אויב**)" dwelling in the land of Joseph may derive from the "rules of war" in Deuteronomy 20, which establish a difference between the nations living nearby and those farther away<sup>60</sup>. However, the lack of consistency in the terminology used in Deuteronomy 20 makes this proposition problematical: while in Deut 20,1, the term **עם** designates an unspecified enemy of Israel, it refers specifically to the inhabitants of a city of a remote nation in verse 11. Likewise, while the word is employed in a general sense in verses 1, 3 and 4, in verse 11 it describes faraway enemies. Furthermore, the neighboring people are called in one place **גרים** (verse 15) and in the other **עמים** (verse 16). In my opinion, the word "**נכר** (foreigner)" (which is not mentioned in Deuteronomy 20) is the key to understanding the distinction between the fools and the nations; in other words, the fools are not foreigners. For the purpose of comparison, it is interesting to note that Josephus, who also situates the appearance of the Samaritans at the time of the Assyrian conquest of the kingdom of Israel, explicitly states that they were foreign settlers of pagan stock; the very appellation "Cutheans" which he uses to designate them, leaves no doubt as to their non-Israelite origins (*Ant* 9:288-291). In contradistinction, we find no mention of the bringing of foreign settlers in 4Q372 1, and it is very unclear under what circumstances the "fools" came to occupy Joseph's territory. 4Q372 1 leaves the question of their origins unanswered. Were they formerly part of Joseph's tribe? Schuller has suggested that Joseph's commitment to teach God's law to "all who abandon" the Torah (l. 27) could be read "more specifically and

<sup>58</sup> Neither is there in 4Q372 1 any parallel to "οὗκ ἔστιν ἔθνος" found in Sir 50.25-26 (G).

<sup>59</sup> As it seems, this account was intended to deny the Samaritans' claim that they descended not only from Joseph but also from Levi.

<sup>60</sup> M. POPOVIĆ, "Abraham and the Nations in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Exclusivism and Inclusivism in the Texts from Qumran and the Absence of a Reception History for Gen 12:3", *Abraham, the Nations, and the Hagarites*. Jewish, Christian, and Islamic Perspectives on Kinship with Abraham (eds. M. GOODMAN *et al.*) (TBN 13; Leiden 2010) 77-103, here 92-93.

polemically in reference to the Samaritans”<sup>61</sup>. If so, it would imply that the author regarded the Gerizim worshippers as some kind of apostates, who had formerly been bound to God’s Law and to its people. This proposition is acceptable if we rule out the possibility that line 22, in which Joseph prays that God may exterminate from the earth some people, does not refer to the “enemy people”, seemingly the Gerizim worshippers; it is however difficult to verify such a hypothesis.

In any event, 4Q372 1 refers to three discrete categories: Israel (which encompasses the tribes of Joseph, Levi, Judah and Benjamin), the foreign nations that are considered as a unit, and the “fools” who neither are (not anymore?) part of the people Israel nor belong to the foreign nations. Nonetheless, they are not to be regarded as an unshaped mass of people, a non-people; rather, they exist as a constituted (enemy) people. However, we must be careful not to draw conclusions too hastily, for, as we have seen, 4Q372 1(line 27) seemingly considers the possibility for a “fool” to repent. Furthermore, it should be asked how representative of the general outlook of the Jews this text was. Although the discovered manuscripts give no indications regarding the identity of its author(s), Schwartz and Pummer tend to ascribe the composition of 4Q372 to the sectarians at Qumran<sup>62</sup>. If this assumption is correct, then the text would attest only to the hostility of a restricted Jewish community.

## II. A REVERSE MIRROR IMAGE OF EACH OTHER:

### 2 MACC (5,22-23; 6,1-2) AND THE SAMARITAN INSCRIPTIONS FROM DELOS

As will be shown below, in spite of the above-mentioned evidence for anti-Samaritan sentiment among second-century B.C.E. Jews, the relationship between the Gerizim and Jerusalem worshippers at that time was actually multifaceted and cannot be simply regarded as one of mutual alienation.

#### 1. 2 Macc (5:22-23; 6:1-2)

2 Maccabees claims to be an epitome of Jason of Cyrene’s lost work that comprised five volumes. While Jason’s work is usually ascribed to the

<sup>61</sup> SCHULLER, “4Q372 1”, 366.

<sup>62</sup> S. SCHWARTZ, “Destruction”, 12; PUMMER, *Josephus*, 20. SCHULLER – BERNSTEIN, “4QNarrative”, 154, for their part, have seen no ground on vocabulary or theological basis to ascribe this document to the sectarians at Qumran. See also SCHULLER, “4Q372 1”, 350.

first Hasmonaean generation, the date of its abridgement is still disputed; it has been variously dated between the reign of John Hyrcanus (134-104 B.C.E.) and Pompey's conquest of Judea (63 B.C.E.)<sup>63</sup>. 2 Maccabees treats of the Jews' revolt against Antiochus IV Epiphanes until the defeat of the Seleucid general Nicanor (161 B.C.E.). Two passages of this work are of direct concern to our discussion. The first one, 2 Macc 5,22-23 depicts the situation in the Land of Israel following the plundering of the Temple of Jerusalem by Antiochus IV Epiphanes and his departure to Antioch (summer 168 B.C.E.):

He (sc. Antiochus) went so far as to leave officials in charge of maltreating our race (τὸ γένος): at Jerusalem, Philip, a Phrygian by birth, but by character more barbaric than the man who appointed him; and at Mount Gerizim, Andronikos; and in addition, Menelaus, who was worse than the others inasmuch as he lorded it over his compatriots<sup>64</sup>.

As it has been widely observed, the author explicitly recognizes the YHWH worshippers on Mount Gerizim and in Jerusalem as belonging to the same "race", i.e., the Jewish people<sup>65</sup>. The second passage that is of interest refers to the beginning of the religious persecution (2 Macc 6,1-2):

Not long thereafter, the king sent Geron the Athenian to compel the Jews (τοὺς Ἰουδαίους) to depart from their ancestral laws (τῶν πατρίων νόμων) and to cease living by the laws of God. He was also to defile both the temple in Jerusalem and the temple on Mount Gerizim and to proclaim the former to be the temple of Zeus Olympios and the latter (in accordance with the [. . .] of the inhabitants of the place) to be the temple of Zeus Xenios (καὶ τὸν ἐν Γαριζὶν καθὼς ἐτύγγανον οἱ τὸν τόπον οἰκοῦντες Διὸς Ξενίου)<sup>66</sup>.

Here again, the category of Jews encompasses both the YHWH worshippers in Jerusalem and on Mount Gerizim. However, the portrayal of the Samaritans in this account remains a matter of controversy. In the view of certain scholars, this passage displays a strong anti-Samaritan bias<sup>67</sup>; much of the debate depends on the significance of the phrase καθὼς ἐτύγγανον οἱ τὸν τόπον οἰκοῦντες and the word Ξενίου in v. 2. Three main interpretations have been advanced:

<sup>63</sup> On the Second Book of Maccabees, see J.A. GOLDSTEIN, *II Maccabees* (AB 41A; Garden City, NY 1983) 3-188; D.R. SCHWARTZ, *2 Maccabees* (CEJL; Berlin – New York 2008) 3-126.

<sup>64</sup> Translation: GOLDSTEIN, *II Maccabees*, 245.

<sup>65</sup> See GOLDSTEIN, *II Maccabees*, 261; SCHWARTZ, *2 Maccabees*, 264; R. DORAN, *2 Maccabees: A Critical Commentary* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis, MN 2012) 229.

<sup>66</sup> Translation: GOLDSTEIN, *II Maccabees*, 268.

<sup>67</sup> See, for instance, KARTVEIT, *Origin*, 238.



- 1) In the wake of Benedictus Niese at the beginning of the past century <sup>68</sup>, many have altered ἐτύγγανον to ἐνετύγγανον and have interpreted the discussed passage as meaning that the temple on Mt. Gerizim was renamed Zeus Xenios, at the request of the inhabitants of the place. This emendation makes 2 Macc 6,2 correspond to the above-mentioned letter preserved by Josephus that speaks of a group calling themselves the “Sidonians in Shechem” and demanding of Antiochus IV that their temple be renamed after Zeus Hellenios (*Ant* 12:258-261). However, this translation is by no means certain. As Pummer has stressed, it finds no support in the manuscript evidence; besides, according to Josephus, the Sidonians in Shechem requested their sanctuary be dedicated to Zeus Hellenios, not Xenios <sup>69</sup>. Furthermore, the proposed emendation would create some inconsistency with the fact that Antiochus’ emissary was sent to “compel (ἀναγκάζειν)” the Jews to rename both temples in Jerusalem and in Gerizim. And, finally, 2 Macc 6,3 reads that these measures were grievous and vexing for the “whole [people] (τοῖς ὅλοις), i.e., both in Jerusalem and in Gerizim; just as in 2 Macc 5,22-23, Jews and Samaritans are depicted as co-victims of Antiochus’ measures. Thus, it seems unlikely that the original meaning of this passage was that the inhabitants of Gerizim requested the renaming of their temple.
- 2) It has also been advanced that 2 Macc 6,2 contains a polemical allusion to the foreign origins of the Samaritans. This proposal rests on the premise that Διὸς Ξενίου refers here to “Zeus the protector of strangers”; accordingly, the passage should be translated as follows: “(the temple on Mount Gerizim was renamed after) Zeus the protector of strangers, as were they that dwelt in the place”. On this basis, it has been suggested that 2 Macc 6,2 may be alluding to the interpretation of 2 Kings 17 according to which the Samaritans were descended from foreign settlers <sup>70</sup>. This proposal, however, creates a discrepancy with the author’s inclusion of the Gerizim worshippers in the Jewish category (both in 2 Macc 5,22-23 and in 6,1-2). Furthermore, it is conspicuous that the laws of God are here referred to as “the ancestral laws (τῶν πατρίων νόμων)” of the YHWH worshippers both in Jerusalem and in Gerizim. This clearly shows that from the author’s point of view, the latter shared common ancestry. For the purposes of comparison,

<sup>68</sup> On this, see R. DORAN, “2 Maccabees 6:2 and The Samaritan Question”, *HTR* 76 (1983) 481-485, here 481.

<sup>69</sup> PUMMER, *Josephus*, 14-15.

<sup>70</sup> See HANHART, “Zu den ältesten Traditionen”, 108\*-110\*; KARTVEIT, *Origin*, 239-240.

Josephus, in his repeated statements that the Samaritans were of pagan stock, felt it necessary to clarify that their seemingly Jewish practices did not derive from their own ancestral laws (*Ant* 9:290; 12:258-259).

- 3) Others have interpreted Διὸς Ξενίου as designating Zeus Hospitable; if so, καθὼς ἐτύγγανον οἱ τὸν τόπον οἰκοῦντες Διὸς Ξενίου would mean that the inhabitants of the place happened be hospitable like Zeus <sup>71</sup>. Nothing in the text seems to contradict this possibility; moreover, some support for it may be found in a statement of (Pseudo?-) Eupolemus that the inhabitants of the city at the Gerizim temple received Abraham hospitably (see below).

On the whole, it would appear that 2 Macc 6,1-2 displays no hostility towards the Samaritans. Therefore, in this regard, the attitude of the author towards the Gerizim Temple needs to be further examined. The very fact that he has written that Antiochus ordered his subordinate to “defile (μολῶναι)” the sanctuary on Mount Gerizim presupposes that, in his eyes, this Temple possessed some degree of sanctity. It is interesting to note here that in 2 Macc 5,15 the author calls the Temple in Jerusalem “the holiest temple of all the earth (τὸ πάσης τῆς γῆς ἁγιώτατον ἱερόν)”. Although it affirms the pre-eminence of the Jerusalem temple, this statement may imply that it was not the only holy temple. Jonathan A. Goldstein writes in this respect: “Thus, Jason of Cyrene, the staunch partisan of the primacy of the temple of Jerusalem (vss. 15-20, 2:22, 3:12, etc.), here [sc. 5,22-23] and at 6:2 concedes legitimacy to the Samaritan claims for Mount Gerizim, which, after all, had a basis in Deut 27:4-12” <sup>72</sup>.

## 2. *The Samaritan inscriptions from Delos*

It is interesting that the passages from 2 Maccabees that we have often quoted above do present some analogies with the so-called Samaritan inscriptions from Delos. In 1979-80, the archeologists of the École Française d’Athènes discovered on the island of Delos two Greek inscriptions engraved on marble *stelai*. These are honorific dedications to some benefactors or patrons made by: “The Israelites on Delos who make offerings to hallowed *Argarizein* (οἱ ἐν Δήλῳ Ἰσραελεῖται οἱ ἀπαρχόμενοι εἰς ἱερόν Ἀργαριζεῖν)”, and “The Israelites who make offerings to hallowed, consecrated *Argarizein* (Ἰσραηλῖται οἱ ἀπαρχόμενοι εἰς ἱερόν

<sup>71</sup> See for example: DORAN, *2 Maccabees*, 124. For the opposite opinion, see PUMMER, *Josephus*, 14-15.

<sup>72</sup> GOLDSTEIN, *II Maccabees*, 261.

ἄγιον Ἀργαριζειν). On the basis of paleographic considerations, Philippe Bruneau has dated the first *stèle* to between 150 B.C.E. and 50 B.C.E., and the second to the period between 250-175 B.C.E.<sup>73</sup> I will not proceed here with a detailed analysis of the inscriptions, which have been extensively examined in other studies<sup>74</sup>. Our discussion will focus exclusively on the self-designation of the dedicators; this contains two elements, which function as self-identity markers:

- 1) The declared belonging to the people of Israel;
- 2) The belief in the sanctity of Mount Gerizim (*Argarizein*).

As it has been unanimously admitted, these two features correspond to the fundamental characteristics of the Samaritans. Thus, we have here clear evidence of the presence of a Samaritan community on Delos in the period between the third and the first century B.C.E. On closer scrutiny, these inscriptions have even further implications: the fact that they both refer to “the Israelites *who make offerings to Mount Gerizim*” presupposes that from the standpoint of their authors, an Israelite was not necessarily a Gerizim worshipper; in theory, the dedicators also recognized as Israelites individuals who did not send contributions to the temple on Mount Gerizim. The fact that a Jewish community was established on Delos at the same time (1 Macc 15,23; *Ant* 14:213-216, 231-232) makes it not unlikely that the Delian Jews called themselves and were referred to as “the Israelites *who make offerings to the (holy) temple in Jerusalem*”<sup>75</sup>. The use by the Jews of the term *Israelites* to refer to themselves is not uncommon in ancient sources<sup>76</sup>. It is essential to note here that just as 2 Maccabees considered Yahwistic worshippers both in Jerusalem and in Gerizim to be Jews, the dedicators of the above-mentioned inscriptions regarded as Israelites contributors both to *Argarizein* and Jerusalem. We have here testimony from both sides that (at least some) Jerusalem and Gerizim Yahwistic worshippers retained a sense of common identity. In both cases, they are depicted

<sup>73</sup> P. BRUNEAU, “Les Israélites de Délos et la juiverie délienne”, *BCH* 106 (1982) 465-504. This dating has been generally accepted; see A.T. KRAABEL, “New Evidence of the Samaritan Diaspora Has Been Found on Delos”, *BA* 47 (1984) 44-46. L.M. WHITE, “The Delos Synagogue Revisited Recent Fieldwork in the Graeco-Roman Diaspora”, *HTR* 80 (1987) 133-160, esp. 144-145, has ascribed the first inscription to after 166 B.C.E., and the second one to before this date.

<sup>74</sup> See, among others, BRUNEAU, “Israélites”; KRAABEL, “Evidence”; WHITE, “Synagogue”, 141-147; KARTVEIT, *Origin*, 216-225; DUŠEK, *Inscriptions*, 75-79.

<sup>75</sup> The same point was made by my friend and colleague DUŠEK, *Inscriptions*, 77.

<sup>76</sup> 1 Maccabees refers in several instances to the υἱοὶ Ἰσραὴλ (3,15.41; 7,9.13.23); the term Ἰσραηλιταὶ can be found later in the Book of Acts 2,22; 3,12; 5,35; 13,16; 21,28; and in Rom 9,4; 2 Cor 11,22. It may be added that the wording ישראל is widely used as an internal designation in rabbinic literature.

not as independent categories but as sub-categories subsumed under the broader category Israelites/Jews.

### 3. *Resisting the categories of Jews and Samaritans? The cases of Theodotus and (Pseudo?)-Eupolemus*

This section will discuss the case of two second-century B.C.E. authors, Theodotus and (Pseudo?)-Eupolemus, who have been variously considered to be Samaritans or Jews. Determining their identity has proved to be a most perplexing dilemma.

First, we will discuss Theodotus. A writer of the second century B.C.E.<sup>77</sup>, Theodotus is only known by a poem partially preserved by Eusebius of Caesarea (fourth century C.E.); Eusebius, though, was not quoting directly from Theodotus but from the Greek historian Alexander Polyhistor (ca. 105-35 B.C.E.)<sup>78</sup>. Thus, the portion of the poem as it appears in Eusebius is composed both of literal quotations of Theodotus and of the abridgements of Polyhistor. It is usually assumed that Theodotus composed his poem in the language and style of Homeric epic. According to Polyhistor, it was entitled *On the Jews* (περὶ Ἰουδαίων); however, it has been questioned whether this was indeed the original title of Theodotus' work. The surviving section of the poem deals principally with the story of Dinah's rape. It opens with a description of the city of Shechem and its surroundings. Then, Theodotus goes on to tell the sojourn of Jacob in Mesopotamia, his arrival with his family in Shechem's area where he is given a parcel of land by Hamor the ruler of Shechem, the rape of Jacob's daughter, Dinah, by Shechem, Jacob's consent to give Dinah to Shechem on condition that all the Shechemites should be circumcised, and finally the slaughter of Hamor and Shechem by Simeon and Levi and Shechem's destruction by Jacob's other sons. Neither Polyhistor nor Eusebius gives indication whether this section represents the entire scope of Theodotus' poem or whether Dinah's story was his only focus.

The debate on Theodotus' religio-ethnic background and purposes is greatly contingent upon the interpretation one gives to seemingly conflicting

<sup>77</sup> See F.T. FALLON, "Theodotus (Second to First Century B.C.): A New Translation and Introduction", *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Vol. 2: *Expansions of the "Old Testament" and Legends, Wisdom and Philosophical Literature, Prayers, Psalms, and Odes, Fragments of Lost Judeo-Hellenistic Works* (ed. J.A. CHARLESWORTH) (New York 1985) 785-793, here 788.

<sup>78</sup> *Praep. Ev.* 9.22.1-11 (GCS 43.1:512-516). On Alexander Polyhistor, see L. SCHMITZ, "Alexander Cornelius", *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology* (ed. W. SMITH) (New York 1862) 115; B.-Z. WACHOLDER, "Pseudo-Eupolemus' two Greek Fragments on the Life of Abraham", *HUCA* 34 (1963) 83-113, here 83 n. 2.

data found in his poem. Thus, the laudatory description of Shechem and its environs and the designation of the city as “holy city (ἱερὸν ἄστυ)” (l. 7) have led many scholars to claim that Theodotus was Samaritan<sup>79</sup>. In contrast, others have inferred that Theodotus was of Jewish stock from a detail found in Polyhistor’s prose summary, according to which Jacob required all the inhabitants of Shechem to be “circumcised and become Jews (περιτεμνομένους Ἰουδαῖσαι)” (*Praep. Ev.* 9.22.5)<sup>80</sup>. Further support for this would be derived from the title of Theodotus’ work, given as *On the Jews*<sup>81</sup>. Scholars of both “camps”, so to speak, have tried to explain from their own perspective the apparent contradictory elements in Theodotus’ poem. A brief (and non-exhaustive) exposition of the arguments and counterarguments illustrates further how complex the debate is. Advocates of the Samaritan origins of Theodotus have argued, for instance, that the title reported by Alexander Polyhistor was erroneous<sup>82</sup>. Likewise, they have contended that the term Ἰουδαῖσαι which is found in the abridgement should be ascribed to Polyhistor rather than to Theodotus; supporting evidence would be found in an actual quotation of the text where Jacob and his sons are called “Hebrew” (and not “Jews”). As for the purpose of the poem, it has been proposed that Theodotus sought to reply to the anti-Samaritan retellings of Genesis 34 found in the Jewish literature of the time<sup>83</sup>. Scholars who favor Theodotus’ Jewish origins, for their part, have contended that the wording ἱερὸν ἄστυ could also be translated as “splendid city” (rather than as “holy city”)<sup>84</sup>. Besides, the fact that Mount Gerizim is not explicitly referenced but only alluded to in the text has been considered as undermining the Samaritan thesis<sup>85</sup>. Furthermore, it has been deemed unlikely that a Samaritan author would have portrayed in such negative light the “wicked” inhabitants of Shechem; this would

<sup>79</sup> For the opinion that Theodotus was a Samaritan, see J. FREUDENTHAL, *Hellenistische Studien*. Heft 1 und 2. *Alexander Polyhistor und die von ihm erhaltenen Reste jüdischer und samaritanischer Geschichtswerke* (Breslau 1875) 99-100; R.J. BULL, “A Note on Theodotus’ Description of Shechem”, *HTR* 60 (1967) 221-228, here 224; J.D. PURVIS, *The Samaritan Pentateuch and the Origin of the Samaritan Sect* (Cambridge 1968) 13 n. 21; B.-Z. WACHOLDER, “Theodotus”, *EncJud* 15 (1972) 1102; MENDELS, *Land*, 111.

<sup>80</sup> See KIPPENBERG, *Garizim*, 84; COLLINS, “Theodotus”, 91-104; KARTVEIT, *Origin*, 122-140.

<sup>81</sup> Y. GUTMAN, “The Jewish-Hellenistic Epic of Shechem”, *EI* (1954) 158 (Hebrew).

<sup>82</sup> FREUDENTHAL, *Polyhistor*, 99-100.

<sup>83</sup> See MENDELS, *Land*, 110-115.

<sup>84</sup> GUTMAN, “Epic”, 159.

<sup>85</sup> *Praep. Ev.* 9.22.1: “Two strong mountains [sc. Mt. Gerizim and Mt. Ebal] close at hand (Ἐξ αὐτῆς δὲ μάλ’ ἄγχι δὴ οὐρεα φαίνετ’ ἐπυμνά)”. See COLLINS, “Theodotus”, 95. KARTVEIT, *Origin*, 139-140, has taken this argument a step further by considering the non-mention of Mt. Gerizim in Theodotus’ poem to be an anti-Samaritan feature.

rather correspond to the Jewish polemic against the Samaritans as it is reflected in other Jewish works retelling the Dinah episode in Genesis 34<sup>86</sup>. Admittedly, the fact that the poem is partly epitomized causes a serious hindrance for determining what Theodotus' affiliation was. However, the possibility remains that Polyhistor's abridgements are faithful to Theodotus' original text and that both the so-called Samaritan and Jewish features were displayed in his poem. In such a case, it would appear that Theodotus saw no contradiction in praising Shechem and its environs, on the one hand, and in calling his work *περὶ Ἰουδαίων* and using expressions such as *Ἰουδαῖσαι*, on the other. Thus, the current terms of the debate according to which Theodotus was either a Jew or a Samaritan may indeed be misleading; in other words, it may be that Theodotus falls neither into the category of a Jew understood as designating a Yahwistic worshipper exclusively attached to Jerusalem, nor into the category of a Samaritan understood as designating a Yahwistic worshipper exclusively attached to Mount Gerizim.

The second author to be examined is the commonly called Pseudo-Eupolemus whose case is also very compelling. Eusebius' extensive excerpts from Alexander Polyhistor's work *On the Jews* include a fragment on Abraham's life<sup>87</sup>. This account relates that Abraham originated from a Babylonia city and surpassed all other men in wisdom. He travelled to Phoenicia where he taught astrology. Later, the Armenians waged war against the Phoenicians; Abraham came to the help of the latter and defeated the Armenians. The following sentence is of great importance:

He [Abraham] was also received as a guest by the city at the temple Argarizin, which is interpreted 'mountain of the Most High' (ὕπὸ πόλεως ἱερὸν Ἀργαρίζιν ὃ εἶναι μεθερμηνευόμενον ὄρος ὑψίστου). He also received gifts from Melchizedek, who was a priest of God and a king as well<sup>88</sup>.

It is commonly accepted that this interpretation is based upon Gen 14,18, where Melchizedek, the King of Salem is reported to be a priest of the Most High (כהן לאל עליון), and the LXX of Gen 33,18, which calls Salem, a "city of Shechem (Σαλημ πόλιν Σικιμων)"<sup>89</sup>. The narrative continues by telling that Abraham left for Egypt, where he lived with the Egyptian priests at Heliopolis, and taught them the astrological science. At last,

<sup>86</sup> COLLINS, "Theodotus", 94-95. KARTVEIT, *Origin*, 134-135.

<sup>87</sup> *Praep. Ev.* 9.17.2-9 (GCS 43.1:502-504).

<sup>88</sup> Translation: C.R. HOLLADAY, *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors, vol. 1, Historians* (SBLTT 20, Pseudepigrapha Series 10; Chico, CA 1983) 173.

<sup>89</sup> KARTVEIT, *Origin*, 244, adds that Abraham's reception by the city at Argarizin may be based on Gen 12,6, where Abraham arrives at Shechem.

Enoch is presented as the real discoverer of astrology. According to Polyhistor, this account comes from a work by the Jewish historian Eupolemus entitled *On the Jews (of Assyria)* <sup>90</sup>. Eupolemus is otherwise known from a lost writing, possibly called *On the kings in Judea*, of which only several fragments subsist; he is frequently identified with the envoy of Judas Maccabeus to Rome, who is referred to in 1 Macc 8,17 and 2 Macc 4,11 <sup>91</sup>.

Jakob Freudenthal was the first to reject the attribution of the fragment about Abraham to Eupolemus <sup>92</sup>. His main argument against Polyhistor's ascription was that a Jewish historian like Eupolemus could not have depicted Argarizin as the mountain of the Most High on account of the deep hatred between Jews and Samaritans; furthermore, he saw such a depiction as incompatible with the laudatory representation of the Jerusalem Temple elsewhere in Eupolemus' accounts. Freudenthal has presented further arguments in an attempt to justify the identification of Pseudo-Eupolemus as a distinct historian from Eupolemus; thus, in Eupolemus' fragments, Moses and not Abraham (as in Pseudo-Eupolemus) is depicted as the originator of knowledge; and, moreover, Freudenthal has emphasized the supposed distinctive syncretistic character of Pseudo-Eupolemus. Accordingly, Freudenthal assigned the fragment to an unknown Samaritan author, whom he called Pseudo-Eupolemus; in addition, he ascribed to the latter another shorter fragment about Abraham which Polyhistor assigned to the work of an anonymous author (*Praep. Ev.* 9.18.2) <sup>93</sup>. Freudenthal's proposition that the text is of Samaritan provenance has been widely accepted <sup>94</sup>. In support for this view, it has been argued that the writing of "Argarizin" (Ἀργαρίζιν; הרגרזים) in *scriptura continua* (as it appears in [Pseudo-]Eupolemus' account) is generally thought to be the sign of a Samaritan origin. Pummer, however, has demonstrated that this transliteration was used also by non-Samaritans <sup>95</sup>.

<sup>90</sup> It has been argued that τῆς Ἀσσυρίας was not part of the title of the work, but was more likely to be connected the subsequent πόλιν Βαβυλῶνα; see FREUDENTHAL, *Polyhistor*, 207.

<sup>91</sup> On Eupolemus, see FALLON "Eupolemus", *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, 2.861-872.

<sup>92</sup> FREUDENTHAL, *Polyhistor*, 85-87.

<sup>93</sup> GCS 43.1:504-505. This ascription has been challenged by DORAN, "Pseudo-Eupolemus", 873-874, who considers the two fragments to be too dissimilar to stem from the same author; thus for instance, while the first one is monotheistic in outlook, the second is polytheistic.

<sup>94</sup> See, for instance, WACHOLDER, "Pseudo-Eupolemus' Two Greek Fragments", 84; MENDELS, *Land*, 109-110.

<sup>95</sup> R. PUMMER, "Argarizin: A Criterion for Samaritan Provenance?", *JSJ* 18 (1987) 18-25.



Few scholars, though, maintain that the above-mentioned passage belongs to Eupolemus' fragments <sup>96</sup>. Robert Doran has provided the most comprehensive refutation of Freudenthal's conclusions; in his opinion, the understanding of Argarzin as Mount of the Most High does not necessarily reflect a Samaritan outlook. Admittedly, opinions diverge as to whether Salem, the city of Melchizedek, was to be located in the vicinity of Shechem or in Jerusalem. Doran notes, though, that the "genuine Eupolemus" does not seem to have identified Salem with Jerusalem <sup>97</sup>; rather he has stated that the city derived its name from the "Temple of Salomon" (Ἱερὸν Σολομῶνος; *Prae. Ev.* 9.34.13). Thus, he saw no fundamental contradiction between "Pseudo-Eupolemus" and Eupolemus' fragments. Indeed, Freudenthal's reasoning is likely to be based upon a too narrow conception of the Jewish-Samaritan relations at the time. Instead of presupposing that Polyhistor incorrectly attributed the discussed fragment to Eupolemus, perhaps we should reverse the basic postulate of Freudenthal that a Jew could not have written a positive depiction of Mount Gerizim. Thus, this fragment should rather be regarded as evidence that in the mid-second century B.C.E., a Palestinian Jew like Eupolemus, who was undoubtedly attached to the Jerusalem Temple, saw no contradiction in linking Abraham with the Temple at Mt. Gerizim, and identifying the latter as the mountain of the Most High.

#### IV. CONCLUSION

As mentioned at the outset of this paper, the second century B.C.E. is commonly regarded as the critical moment in the process of estrangement between Jews and Samaritans, which resulted in their definitive parting of the ways. The focus of this research has been not just on the relations between the two groups at that time, but more specifically on the Jews' understanding of the Samaritans. Remarkably, the overall picture that emerges from the sources examined does not lend itself to easy answers to these questions.

<sup>96</sup> DORAN, "Pseudo-Eupolemus", *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, 2.873-879. See also W.G. LAMBERT, *The Background of Jewish Apocalyptic* (London 1978) 14; F. MILLAR, "The Background to the Maccabean Revolution: Reflections on Martin Hengel's Judaism and Hellenism", *JJS* 29 (1978) 1-21, here 6 n. 12.

<sup>97</sup> We note with W.G. LAMBERT, *Background*, 14, that the location of Salem in the vicinity of Shechem can be found in Jewish literature, such as in the LXX (Gen 33,18) and *Jub* 30,1.

Although there is probable evidence for an anti-Samaritan attitude in second-century B.C.E. Jewish literature, it should not be overstated. First, in many cases, one cannot be certain whether the Samaritans are really meant. Besides, 4Q372 1 is the only known text that reflects a sense of alienation towards the Samaritans to the point of considering them as non-Israelites; it actually creates a trichotomy between Israel, the Gentiles and the Samaritans. As it appears, the relationship maintained at that time between Gerizim and Jerusalem worshippers was multifaceted and cannot simply be seen as one of antagonism and estrangement. In this respect, the Second Book of Maccabees proves that, at this time, there were Jews who regarded Yahwistic worshippers in Gerizim as a category of Israelites. The reversed mirror image is found in the inscriptions from Delos, which implies the acknowledgement by the Samaritan author of the existence of Israelites who did not send contributions to the temple on Mount Gerizim (but most probably to Jerusalem). More intricate are the cases of Theodotus and (Pseudo-?)Eupolemos whose identity has been much debated. Their combining of Jewish with Samaritan identity markers has been regarded as making no sense, and so this is attributed to textual corruptions. Therefore, the primary focus of the scholarly debate has been on whether they were Jews or Samaritans. There is a good case, though, that this reasoning is based on a retrojection of later conceptions of Jews and Samaritans as fully separate and exclusive categories; as it turns out, in the second century B.C.E., there were Israelites (shall they be called Jews or Samaritans?) who saw no contradiction in paying respect to both Gerizim and Jerusalem. In this regard, a passage in Josephus (*Ant* 18:29-30) implies that Samaritans did patronize the Jerusalem Sanctuary, at least up to the days of the Roman procurator of Judea, Coponius (6-9 C.E.)<sup>98</sup>.

All in all, events like the formation of the Samaritan Pentateuch and the destruction of the Samaritan Temple on Mount Gerizim undoubtedly had far-reaching implications on the relations between Jews and Samaritans, but their effects were not as immediate as many have assumed. In the second century B.C.E. not only were there different opinions among the Jews in regard to the Samaritans, but, as it appears, the borders between the two communities were still fuzzy and overlapping. Furthermore, although a process of estrangement from the Samaritans was already engaged in, it was not seen as definitive or irreversible, as is shown in 4Q372 1 (line 27) which apparently envisages the possibility for a "fool" to repent. Later, in the late first and early second century C.E., we do hear increasing calls arguing for

<sup>98</sup> See S. SAFRAI, *Pilgrimage at the End of the Second Temple Period* (Jerusalem 1985) 100 (Hebrew).

the absolute rupture with the Samaritans, as, for instance, in Josephus' writings who forcefully rejects the Samaritans' claim to belong to the people of Israel (*Ant* 11:291, 341; 12:257), the Gospel of Matthew (10,5b-6), and in the utterances ascribed to certain *tannaim* <sup>99</sup>. Nevertheless, even at that time, the question of the Samaritans' status in relation to that of the Jews was still hotly debated and controversial <sup>100</sup>.

Institute for Biblical Studies  
Faculty of Theology  
Martin Luther University  
Halle-Wittenberg, Germany

Jonathan BOURGEL

#### SUMMARY

The process leading to the ultimate estrangement between Jews and Samaritans is commonly regarded as having occurred in the second century B.C.E. This paper aims at giving an outline of how the Samaritans of that time were conceived by the Jews and to determine whether the latter were already perceived as a well-defined alien group. The picture that emerges from the Jewish sources is remarkable in that not only were there divergent opinions among the Jews in regard to the Samaritans, but also that the borders between the two communities were still blurred and even in parts overlapped each other.

<sup>99</sup> According to *m. Shevi'it* 8.10, Rabbi Eliezer (early second century C.E.) used to say that: "He that eats the bread of the Samaritans is like to one that eats the flesh of swine". See also *t. Pesahim* 2.3, (Zuckerman, 156).

<sup>100</sup> This matter was in fact a subject of controversy among the *Tannaim*. See Y. HERSHKOVITZ, "The Samaritans in Tannaitic Literature", *Yavneh* 2 (1940) 71-105 (Hebrew); L.H. SCHIFFMAN, "Samaritans in Tannaitic Halakhah", *JQR* 75 (1985) 325-350.

## LES ÉCRITURES ANNONÇAIENT-ELLES UN MESSIE SOUFFRANT? DIFFICULTÉS ET RÉPONSES DES ÉVANGILES

Si l'on en croit la déclaration de Jésus aux Onze, après sa résurrection, οὕτως γέγραπται παθεῖν τὸν χριστὸν καὶ ἀναστῆναι ἐκ νεκρῶν τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ, (Lc 24,46), les Écritures avaient effectivement annoncé que le Messie souffrirait avant de ressusciter. En Ac 3,18, après la guérison du boiteux de la Belle Porte, Pierre redit la même chose au peuple qui l'entoure, en insistant même sur le fait que cela fut annoncé par *tous les prophètes*: ὁ [δὲ] θεός, ἃ προκατήγγειλεν διὰ στόματος πάντων τῶν προφητῶν παθεῖν τὸν χριστὸν αὐτοῦ, ἐπλήρωσεν οὕτως. Mais si l'on n'attendait pas de Messie rejeté et mis à mort, c'est sans aucun doute parce que les Écritures ne l'avaient pas explicitement annoncé. Où le lecteur peut-il donc trouver dans les Écritures, en particulier dans les livres prophétiques, que le Messie devait souffrir?

On répondra certes que, grâce à la typologie prophétique, l'évangile de Luc, par exemple, montre que Jésus a dû mourir, rejeté et mis à mort comme les prophètes, parce que prophète <sup>1</sup>. Certes, la typologie prophétique lucanienne montre que Jésus fut prophète, mais cela n'implique pas qu'il fut pour cela le Messie. En quoi la typologie prophétique peut-elle donc confirmer la mort de Jésus *comme Messie*? Les lignes qui suivent vont ainsi s'interroger sur la pertinence des typologies utilisées par les différents évangiles pour décrire la figure de Jésus durant sa Passion eu égard au but proposé, celui de confirmer la nécessité des souffrances et du rejet *du Messie* — et pas seulement d'un prophète, fût-il le plus grand — pour entrer dans la gloire.

Est-il besoin de signaler dès l'abord que la question à peine posée n'est pas historique. Cet essai ne cherche pas à savoir quelles furent les représentations messianiques du judaïsme du Second Temple et des premières générations chrétiennes, comme l'ont fait, il y a quelques décennies, nombre d'exégètes et historiens juifs et chrétiens <sup>2</sup>. La difficulté qui

<sup>1</sup> On reviendra plus loin sur la typologie utilisée par les récits évangéliques.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. les ouvrages collectifs bien connus édités par J. NEUSNER – W.S. GREEN – E. FRIEDLÄNDER, *Judaism and Their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era* (Cambridge 1987) et par J.H. CHARLESWORTH, *The Messiah. Developments in Early Judaism and Christianity*. The First Princeton Symposium on Judaism and Christian Origins (Minneapolis, MN 1992), ainsi que la recension critique très pertinente qu'en fit I.H. MARSHALL, "The Messiah in the First Century. A Review Article", *Criswell Theological Review* 7 (1993) 67-83.

va nous occuper est littéraire et christologique: les passages des Écritures sollicités pour montrer que le Christ/Messie <sup>3</sup> devait souffrir le montrent-ils vraiment?

# I. LES FIGURES BIBLIQUES SOUFFRANTES: ANNONCES DE CELLES DE JÉSUS?

## 1. *Jésus lui-même renvoie aux Écritures*

Commençons par noter qu'avant sa mort Jésus lui-même, sans faire allusion à sa résurrection/glorification et sans dire que sa mort sera celle du Messie, rappelle, en chacun des évangiles, que ce qui advient ou doit advenir — son arrestation, ses souffrances et sa mort violente — accomplit les Écritures. Il le dit en y renvoyant sans entrer dans les détails, en Mt 26,24 et Mc 14,21, où il annonce la trahison de Judas: «Le Fils de l'homme s'en va selon ce qui est écrit de lui», en Mt 26,54 également, où il déclare au disciple qui, par l'épée, a répondu à la violence par la violence, qu'il lui faut souffrir de la violence: «Comment s'accompliraient alors les Écritures selon lesquelles il faut qu'il en soit ainsi?» — la phrase de Jésus est reprise et soulignée au verset suivant par le narrateur: «Tout ceci advint pour que s'accomplissent les Écritures des prophètes».

En Marc, Luc et Jean, c'est également avant d'entrer dans sa Passion que Jésus annonce qu'il lui faut être trahi et mourir pour que s'accomplissent les Écritures, mais de manière précise, en citant la phrase d'un prophète ou d'un psaume. En Mc 14,27, alors qu'après le dernier repas, il va avec ses disciples vers le mont des Oliviers, il leur dit, en citant Za 13,7: «il est écrit: 'Je frapperai le berger, et les brebis seront dispersées'». En Lc 22,37, durant le dernier repas, il cite Is 53,12: «il faut que s'accomplisse en moi ce texte de l'Écriture: 'Il a été compté parmi les impies'. Et, de fait, ce qui me concerne va être accompli». En Jn 13,18 il annonce que l'un des disciples va le trahir en citant le Ps 40/41,10, car, dit-il, «doit

<sup>3</sup> La distinction entre messianologie (l'idée de messie dans le judaïsme ancien) et christologie (l'idée de messie/Christ dans le christianisme ancien), dont Charlesworth dit être l'auteur, n'est donc pas nécessaire pour répondre à la question posée ici, l'enquête étant limitée aux récits évangéliques. Cf. J.H. CHARLESWORTH, «From Messianology to Christology. Problems and Prospects», article de l'ouvrage *The Messiah*, cité dans la note précédente, pp. 3-35.

s'accomplir l'Écriture» selon laquelle «celui qui mange[ait] le pain avec moi, contre moi a levé le talon».

Comme cela vient d'être noté, à la différence de Lc 24,46 et Ac 3,18 cités au tout début de cet essai, les énoncés de Jésus qui viennent d'être brièvement présentés ne mentionnent pas la résurrection — la nécessité de la souffrance et du rejet pour entrer dans la gloire. En renvoyant aux Écritures pour justifier le type de mort qui doit être le sien, globalement ou en citant l'un ou l'autre passage des prophètes et des psaumes, Jésus invite ses disciples à ne pas voir la Passion dans laquelle il est sur le point d'entrer comme un terrible échec ou une impuissance extrême, mais à y lire une cohérence dont les Écritures fournissent la clef. Avec les disciples, le lecteur est ainsi invité à se demander pourquoi Jésus a accepté la violence et le rejet. Car en tous les évangiles le 'il faut' de la Passion et de la mort selon les Écritures lui est attribué: en disant que cette lecture fut proposée par lui, les narrateurs veulent signifier que l'idée ne vient pas d'eux et que, grâce à de nombreuses allusions aux Écritures, leurs récits de sa Passion et de sa mort vont lui donner raison.

Ajoutons qu'en citant Zacharie 13, Isaïe 53 et le Psaume 40/41, Jésus n'y voit pas seulement des exemples illustrant son sort et celui de bien d'autres innocents, trahis et mis à mort; il les voit comme s'ils avaient été écrits — uniquement ou principalement — *pour lui*, pour décrire sa propre Passion et sa mort violente. Cela dit, son autorité herméneutique ne supprime pas les difficultés. Le fait qu'en Matthieu 26 il renvoie de manière générale aux Écritures, sans précision aucune, simplifie d'autant moins la tâche du lecteur que les narrateurs procèdent par allusions discrètes: en quel(s) livre(s) des Écritures sont annoncées sa Passion et sa mort violente? Et si les trois citations faites en Marc 14, Luc 22 et Jean 13 décrivent bien ce à quoi Jésus fut confronté durant sa Passion, elles s'appliquent également à tous ceux qui, innocents, furent, bien avant Jésus, trahis par leurs amis et considérés à tort comme des criminels. Telles quelles, ces citations font de Jésus un innocent injustement persécuté et un leader abandonné par ses fidèles, mais pas nécessairement *le Messie*. Au demeurant, en citant Zacharie 13, Isaïe 53 et le Psaume 40/41, Jésus ne dit pas qu'il s'agit de prophéties à connotation messianique — nous verrons plus loin pourquoi —; il notifie seulement à ses disciples — et les narrateurs à leurs lecteurs — qu'il ne faut pas voir en ce qui l'attend un désastre imprévu et irréversible, mais bien plutôt y lire l'accomplissement des Écritures et donc des voies de Dieu. Comment, en racontant la Passion, les narrateurs vont-ils procéder pour montrer que Jésus avait raison?

## 2. La typologie de la Passion en Marc/Matthieu

Par la voix des narrateurs les récits de la Passion exhaussent-ils les déclarations de Jésus en montrant à leur manière que son rejet et sa mort violente accomplissent les Écritures ou qu'ils font au moins écho au rejet et à la persécution de certaines figures vétérotestamentaires? Il a été récemment montré que le récit de la Passion selon Marc — l'observation vaut aussi pour celui de Matthieu — reprend pratiquement tous les motifs des supplications des justes persécutés <sup>4</sup>. En lisant à la suite les différents épisodes de Marc 14–15 et Matthieu 26–27, on ne peut pas en effet ne pas trouver en chacun au moins un des motifs de ces supplications, comme le montrent les tableaux suivants <sup>5</sup>:

### – Le fidèle et les autres hommes

complot des ennemis Pss 30/31,14; 63/64,5-7; 70/71,10-11	Mc 14,1-2	Mt 26,3-4
trahison d'un ami Ps 40/41,10	Mc 14,10-11	Mt 26,14-16
éloignement ou abandon des amis Pss 30/31,12; 37/38,12; 68/69,9; 87/88,19 solitude du fidèle Pss 24/25,16; 70/71,11; 141/142,5	Mc 14,50-52	Mt 26,56
faux témoins, fausses accusations Pss 26/27,12; 37/38,21; 108/109,4.29	Mc 14,53-59; 15,3	Mt 26,59-62
ils veulent la mort du fidèle Pss 12/13,4; 21/22,16; 69/70,3	Mc 14,64; 15,13-14	Mt 26,66; 27,22-23
insultes, sarcasmes et provocations Pss 21/22,8-9; 101/102,9	Mc 14,65; 15,16- 20.29.31	Mt 26,67-68; 27,27-31.41
le suppliant ne répond ni aux accusations ni aux sarcasmes des ennemis = en toutes les supplications du juste persécuté.	Mc 14,60-61; 15,4-5	Mt 26,62-63; 27,12-14
le suppliant contesté dans son identité religieuse = en toutes les supplications du juste persécuté.	Mc 15,31-32	Mt 27,40-43
poison, etc. Ps 68/69,21	Mc 15,36	Mt 27,48

<sup>4</sup> F. DE CARLO, 'Dio mio, Dio mio, perché mi hai abbandonato?' (Mc 15,34). I Salmi nel racconto della passione di Gesù secondo Marco (AnBib 179; Roma 2009).

<sup>5</sup> Les tableaux reprennent *grosso modo* ceux de mon récent essai sur le genre littéraire des évangiles de Matthieu, de Marc et de Luc: *Jésus, une vie à raconter* (Le livre et le rouleau 50; Namur 2016) 46-47 et 69-70.



– Le fidèle et son Dieu

le suppliant se tourne assidûment vers Dieu (il ne s'adresse ni ne répond à ses adversaires)	Mc 14,32-42	Mt 26,36-46
Dieu déclaré sourd, lointain ou absent Pss 6,4; 10,1; 12/13,2; 21/22,2	Mc 15,34	Mt 27,46
le suppliant déclare être juste et fidèle Pss 7,9; 16/17,3-4; 25/26,1-8; 58/59,4-5; 85/86,2	(Mc 14,49)	(Mt 27,55-56)
le suppliant n'offre pas ses souffrances à Dieu pour le pardon ou la conversion des ennemis = en toutes les supplications du juste persécuté	même chose dans les épisodes de la Passion publique (procès et scènes à la croix)	
le suppliant s'interroge sur les voies de Dieu Ps 76/77,8-11	Mc 15,34	Mt 27,46
l'enjeu est divin, car la mort du fidèle met Dieu lui-même en question (lui qui a promis de protéger qui lui est fidèle). Il doit sauver son fidèle pour que celui-ci puisse le louer — la louange étant ce par quoi Dieu est reconnu comme sauveur juste et tout-puissant Pss 6,6; 87/88,11-13; 141/142,8		

Les correspondances entre les motifs des supplications des justes persécutés et les récits de la Passion et de la mort de Jésus en Marc et Matthieu sont indéniables. Mais sont-elles occasionnelles ou ont-elles été voulues et ordonnancées par les narrateurs? Une réponse pertinente peut être fournie si l'on considère les scènes au pied de la croix en ces deux évangiles, car elles montrent que les narrateurs Marc/Matthieu y ont repris le schéma du Psaume 21/22 en l'inversant pour l'adapter au récit. Car si dans les supplications, on part du cri pour ensuite en donner les raisons,

cri	«Au secours», «vers Dieu mon cri», «Dieu viens à mon aide», etc.
raisons	les ennemis veulent la perte du fidèle; ils complotent, tissent leurs filets, ricanent, etc. Dieu seul à pouvoir sauver de la mort

dans un récit, les deux composantes doivent être inversées,

raisons	Les ennemis du protagoniste veulent sa perte et complotent contre lui, ils l'accusent, le condamnent et le portent vers un lieu de supplice
cri	il se tourne pour cela vers Dieu en criant: «Dieu, viens à mon aide», etc.

Dans un précédent article j'ai déjà montré que les scènes au pied de la croix en Marc — ajoutons maintenant: également en Matthieu — reprennent systématiquement, mais en ordre inverse, comme il se doit dans un récit, des motifs du Psaume 21/22 <sup>6</sup>:

<i>Psaume 21/22</i>	<i>Marc 15</i>
<i>a</i> le persécuté appelle Dieu (v. 2)  <i>b</i> causes justifiant le cri: paroles: insultes (v. 8 s) actions: vêtements divisés (v. 19)	<i>b</i> causes préparant le cri: actions: divisèrent ses vêtements (v. 24b) paroles: insultes (v. 29b)  <i>a</i> Jésus appelle Dieu (v.34).

L'ordre devait être inversé, car la logique du psaume est de formuler le cri (a) et, seulement après, ses motivations, à savoir la situation mortifère du suppliant (b), alors que, dans le récit, les actions et les paroles des ennemis (b) ont comme effet de provoquer la réaction de celui qui est agressé, Jésus (a). La reprise en séquence des motifs du Psaume 21/22 dans les scènes au pied de la croix rend aussi le lecteur attentif aux autres motifs des supplications des justes persécutés déjà présents dans les épisodes antérieurs de la Passion, tout au long de Marc 14–15 — également de Matthieu 26–27. On peut sans risque d'erreur conclure que les récits de la Passion en Marc/Matthieu ont utilisé la figure des persécutés des supplications pour décrire la manière dont Jésus fut rejeté et mis à mort: la typologie n'a pas seulement déterminé le choix des épisodes et des scènes, elle a également permis de décrire le drame vécu par Jésus, à l'instar des suppliants des psaumes <sup>7</sup>. C'est d'ailleurs en fonction du modèle fourni par ces supplications qu'il faut interpréter le cri de Jésus, «Mon Dieu, mon Dieu, pourquoi m'as-tu abandonné?». Étant donné le modèle constitué par ces supplications et suivi avec constance par Marc/Matthieu, le cri final

<sup>6</sup> Cf. J.-N. ALETTI, «De l'usage des modèles en exégèse biblique. Le cas de la mort de Jésus dans le récit marcen», dans *Palabra, prodigio, poesia*. In *Memoriam P. Luis Alonso Schökel, S.J.* (éd. V. COLLADO BERTOMEU) (AnBib 151; Rome 2003) 337-348.

<sup>7</sup> La relation typologique n'empêche pourtant pas qu'il y ait des différences entre le figurant (le type) et le figuré (l'anti-type). Ainsi la demande de destruction totale des ennemis qui se rencontre en un certain nombre de ces supplications (cf. Pss 16/17,13; 27/28,4; 30/31,18-19; 34/35,3-8; 58/59,14; 69/70,3-4; 140/141,7.10) ne se trouve évidemment pas sur les lèvres de Jésus.

de Jésus ne pouvait être qu'un cri d'appel au secours. En reprenant celui du Psaume 21/22, objectera-t-on, les narrateurs de Marc/Matthieu ne n'entendent-ils pas montrer que Jésus pense avoir été abandonné par Dieu et que sa foi défaille? En réalité, il faut interpréter ce cri en référence à la structure à laquelle il renvoie, celle des supplications des justes persécutés, où l'enjeu est théologique: la mort du juste soulève la question d'un Dieu qui a dit devoir protéger ses fidèles et pouvoir ainsi montrer qu'il est lui-même juste, mais aussi tout-puissant contre les malfaisants, car, dans les supplications, les ennemis du juste persécuté le sont surtout de Dieu. Reprenant littéralement ce cri, Marc/Matthieu soulignent à l'envi cet enjeu *théologique* <sup>8</sup>.

En narrant la Passion de Jésus à partir du modèle des supplications du juste persécuté, Marc et Matthieu exhaussent la déclaration de Jésus: ses souffrances et sa mort violente ont bien été annoncées par les Écritures. En est-il de même en Luc et Jean?

### 3. La typologie en Luc et Jean

#### Le récit de Luc

La manière de procéder du narrateur lucanien diffère de celle de Marc/Matthieu, car, comme je l'ai montré ailleurs <sup>9</sup>, il laisse à Jésus le soin de prendre en charge la typologie prophétique dès son premier discours à Nazareth et de la développer tout au long de son ministère. Un prophète authentique doit en effet être à la fois reconnu et menacé, pire: rejeté <sup>10</sup>, et si dans la première partie du ministère de Jésus, qui va jusqu'à la confession de Pierre, c'est le volet reconnaissance qui prévaut, durant la montée vers Jérusalem, c'est au contraire le volet rejet et souffrance qui est souligné, comme le montre le schéma suivant <sup>11</sup>:

<sup>8</sup> On connaît la réflexion de J. MOLTSMANN, *Der gekreuzigte Gott*. Das Kreuz Christi als Grund und Kritik christlicher Theologie (München 1972) 143: «Il n'est pas correct d'interpréter le cri de Jésus à partir du Psaume 22, mais il est plus correct d'interpréter les paroles du psaume à partir de la situation de Jésus». L'affirmation vaudrait s'il s'agissait d'une phrase isolée, alors que le récit de la Passion en Marc/Matthieu reprend en son entièreté la structure relationnelle décrite par toutes les supplications des justes persécutés. Il ne s'agit pas d'une opposition (entweder... oder, dirait-on en allemand), mais d'un va-et-vient herméneutique exigé par la typologie à l'œuvre.

<sup>9</sup> J.N. ALETTI, *Jésus, une vie à raconter*, 107-127.

<sup>10</sup> Les passages bibliques ne manquent pas: 1R 18,4; 19,10.14; Neh 9,26; Jr 11,18-22; 15,10.15; 18,18; 26,20-24. La mort des prophètes est devenue un leitmotiv dans *Les vies des prophètes*, écrit juif du 1<sup>er</sup> siècle avant J.C.

<sup>11</sup> Le tableau est repris de J.N. ALETTI, *Jésus, une vie à raconter*, 123.

Discours de Jésus à Nazareth Lc 4,20-30  
Admiré et reconnu (Lc 4,22) et, immédiatement après, rejeté et menacé  
(Lc 4,28-29)

*Jésus, prophète reconnu*  
= Lc 5,1 à 9,21

7,16 (le peuple: un grand prophète)  
7,19-22 (Jésus: v.22 = Is 61,1)  
7,24-27 (Jésus: JB = préparer ses chemins)  
7,49 (les gens: qui est celui pardonnant les péchés?)  
8,24-25 (les disciples: qui est celui à qui les éléments obéissent?)  
8,28 (le possédé: Jésus, Fils du Dieu Très-Haut)  
9,7-9 (Hérode: qui est celui-ci?)  
9,18-20 (les gens: Élie, un des grands prophètes)  
9,18-20 (les disciples: le Christ de Dieu)

épisode représentatif = Lc 7,11-17

*Jésus, prophète rejeté et mis à mort*  
= Lc 9,22 à 19,44

En plus des annonces de la Passion par Jésus (9,22; 9,43b-44 18,31-34)  
11,29-32 (Jésus: génération mauvaise ... Jonas)  
11,47 (Jésus: vous construisez les sépulcres des prophètes ...)  
11,48 (Jésus: vos pères ont mis à mort les prophètes ...)  
11,50-51 (Jésus: le sang des prophètes)  
13,33-34 (Jésus: Jérusalem, toi qui mets à mort les prophètes)  
17,17 (Jésus: les 9 autres, où sont-ils?)

épisode représentatif = Lc 17,11-19

En Luc, la typologie prophétique est ainsi une des principales clefs de lecture de l'identité de Jésus. Pourquoi en est-il ainsi? Si Jésus fut reconnu comme prophète par les foules mais pas par les élites religieuses, il importait de montrer que le refus de croire de ces dernières ne menaçait aucune-ment la vérité de l'identité prophétique de Jésus <sup>12</sup>; grâce à son double volet de reconnaissance et de rejet la typologie lucanienne honore cette réalité.

Mais, dira-t-on, les allusions aux figures prophétiques du passé biblique sont beaucoup moins nombreuses dans les récits de la Passion que durant la montée vers Jérusalem. On ne rencontre, il est vrai, qu'une seule mention explicite, dans la bouche des gardes qui ridiculisent Jésus: «Fais le prophète! Qui t'a frappé?» (Lc 22,64). Cela ne saurait être interprété comme une absence, car le narrateur fait des événements de la Passion l'effectuation

<sup>12</sup> Dans *Jésus, une vie à raconter*, p.127, après «prophétique» j'ai ajouté entre parenthèses «et messianique». Si la parenthèse n'est pas erronée, elle constitue cependant un raccourci qu'il importait de prouver, l'occasion m'étant présentement donnée. Répétons-le, les annonces faites par Jésus avant sa Passion dans les évangiles ne sont pas de soi messianiques: il ne dit pas que, selon les Écritures, il devait, *comme Messie*, souffrir violence et rejet.

des annonces de Jésus sur la mort des prophètes (cf. également Lc 22,37). Et si le récit lucanien de la Passion n'est pas ordonnancé à l'aide de motifs tirés de récits bibliques relatant la mort d'un prophète, c'est parce qu'il n'en existait pas — sauf en l'un ou l'autre récit extrabiblique. C'est plutôt l'innocence des prophètes et l'injustice de leur mort que retient Luc, motif plusieurs fois répété par Jérémie et exprimé clairement à ses opposants en Jr 26,15:

«Sachez bien que, si vous me tuez,  
vous aurez le sang d'un innocent sur vous,  
et sur cette ville et sur ses habitants,  
car c'est vraiment YHWH qui m'a envoyé vers vous  
prononcer toutes ces paroles à vos oreilles»

En insistant sur la reconnaissance explicite (par Pilate, le juge, par le malfaiteur crucifié avec lui, par le centurion enfin) et implicite (les femmes de Jérusalem, toutes les foules présentes au pied de la croix) de l'innocence de Jésus, le narrateur lucanien fait ainsi de la Passion et de la mort l'épreuve grâce à laquelle l'identité prophétique de Jésus trouve son ultime confirmation — grâce aux saintes Écritures.

### Le récit de Jean

Si la typologie des récits synoptiques de la Passion se fait uniquement par allusions, celle du récit de la Passion en Jean est en revanche des plus explicites. Par trois fois, en Jn 19,24.36.37, le narrateur signale que l'Écriture trouve son accomplissement:

- «ils se sont partagé mes vêtements, et ma tunique ils l'ont tirée au sort»  
Jn 19, 24 = Ps 21/22,18
- «pas un de ses os ne sera brisé» Jn 19,36 = Ex 12,46 <sup>13</sup>
- «ils regarderont celui qu'ils ont transpercé» Jn 19,37 = Za 12,10

Pour le sujet qui nous occupe et sans nous attarder sur les figures vétérotestamentaires auxquelles il renvoie, ni sur de possibles allusions scripturaires, retenons seulement pour notre sujet que le narrateur du récit de la Passion en Jn tient à souligner qu'effectivement les Écritures trouvent leur accomplissement dans les scènes au pied de la croix.

<sup>13</sup> Les commentateurs de Jn 19,36 pensent que ce verset ne renvoie pas seulement à Ex 12,46 mais aussi à Ps 33/34,20/21, à cause du verbe συντριβήσεται. Double allusion que R.B. Hays interprète ainsi: "[T]he metaleptic reminiscence of Psalm 34 suggests not only that Jesus, the Righteous One par excellence, was to be rescued by God but that his rescue portends God's ultimate rescue of all the righteous from all their afflictions (as in Ps 34:19)" (*Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels* [Waco, TX 2016] 317).

## Bilan provisoire

Les quatre récits de la Passion mettent ainsi implicitement (les Synoptiques) ou explicitement (Jean) la mort de Jésus en relation à des figures vétérotestamentaires: Marc/Matthieu aux justes persécutés des psaumes de supplication <sup>14</sup>, Luc aux prophètes injustement mis à mort, et Jean, entres autres figures, à l'agneau pascal. Fort bien. Mais le problème initialement posé — le nécessaire passage du Messie par le rejet et la mort violente — demeure. Car si, selon ces différentes typologies, Jésus est bien le juste persécuté par excellence, le prophète eschatologique et l'agneau pascal, cela n'implique pas qu'il ait dû souffrir *parce que Messie*. La question à laquelle il importe de répondre est donc la suivante: en quoi les différentes typologies qui viennent d'être mentionnées peuvent-elles confirmer la nécessité des souffrances et du rejet *du Messie*?

## II. DU JÉSUS MESSIE GLORIEUX AU JÉSUS MESSIE SOUFFRANT

### 1. *En quête du Messie?*

Que les personnages des différents récits évangéliques s'interrogent continûment sur l'identité de Jésus, point n'est besoin d'insister tant cela relève du truisme. Pour beaucoup d'entre eux c'est en outre un prophète, comme le rapportent les disciples, lorsque Jésus leur demande ce que les gens disent de lui <sup>15</sup>, une réaction confirmée par ses propres déclarations <sup>16</sup>.

Si l'opinion commune voit en Jésus un prophète, en est-il de même pour son être-Messie? Les foules se demandent-elles aussi fréquemment s'il est tel? Un questionnement explicite généralisé est quasiment absent des

<sup>14</sup> Les commentaires relèvent habituellement les motifs communs aux fidèles des supplications et au serviteur souffrant d'Isaïe 52,12 – 53,12. Comme cela fut signalé plus haut, Lc 22,37 cite d'ailleurs Is 53,12. Sans nier les ressemblances, disons que si le poème d'Isaïe 53 fut retenu par les premiers chrétiens comme une annonce de la mort à la fois ignominieuse et salvifique de Jésus, les récits synoptiques de la Passion ne retiennent pas la composante salvifique de cette mort, suivant en cela les supplications où les justes persécutés n'offrent pas leurs souffrances et leur rejet pour le salut de leurs ennemis. Certes, l'aspect salvifique est présent chez les Synoptiques, mais avant la Passion — par ex. Mc 14,46 / Mt 20,28 —, en particulier à la dernière cène — Mc 14,24 / Mt 26,27-28 / Lc 22,19-20 —, et non durant les épisodes qui vont de l'arrestation à la mort inclusivement.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. Mc 8,28 / Mt 16,14 / Lc 9,19. Affirmation illustrée par les passages suivants: Mt 21,11; 21,46; Mc 6,15 / Lc 9,7.8; 24,19. L'équivalent se rencontre en Jn 4,19; 6,14; 7,40; 9,17.

<sup>16</sup> Le dire de Jésus se trouve lui aussi dans les quatre récits: Mt 13,57 / Mc 6,4; Lc 4,24; 13,33; Jn 4,44.

Synoptiques <sup>17</sup>. La reconnaissance messianique y est plutôt le fait des disciples, explicitement avec la confession de Pierre et l'acclamation collective lors de l'entrée à Jérusalem <sup>18</sup>, et implicitement avec la demande des fils de Zébédée <sup>19</sup>. Mais en Jean, l'identité messianique de Jésus par les foules revient plusieurs fois: «Dans la foule beaucoup crurent en lui, et ils disaient: 'le Messie fera-t-il autant de σημεῖα que celui-ci [Jésus] n'en a fait?'» (Jn 7,31). «D'autres disaient: 'Le Messie, c'est lui'. Mais d'autres encore disaient: 'Le Messie pourrait-il venir de la Galilée?' L'Écriture ne dit-elle pas qu'il sera de la lignée de David et qu'il viendra de Bethléem, la petite cité dont David était originaire?' C'est ainsi que la foule se divisa à son sujet» (Jn 7,41-43). Les autorités religieuses, elles, refusent de voir en lui le Messie et décident de chasser de la synagogue quiconque le reconnaîtrait tel (Jn 9,22). Disciples et amis quant à eux reconnaissent en Jésus le Messie (Jn 1,41.49 <sup>20</sup>; 11,27). Que l'identité messianique de Jésus ait autant d'importance en Jean s'explique sans aucun doute par le projet du narrateur, qui a écrit pour que ses lecteurs «croient que Jésus est le Christ/Messie et le Fils de Dieu» (Jn 20,31).

On pourrait penser que l'identité messianique vient d'abord des personnages humains, disciples ou foules. Les évangiles de l'enfance (Matthieu 1–2 et Luc 1–2) montrent cependant que la problématique messianique est évoquée par le narrateur en Matthieu, dès la généalogie, puisque Jésus est fils de Joseph, lui-même descendant du roi David (Mt 1,16; 2,1), et confirmée par la déclaration des mages, venus adorer «le roi des Juifs» (Mt 2,2), expression comprise messianiquement par Hérode, les grands prêtres et les scribes (Mt 2,4-5). Est ainsi introduite la problématique propre à ce narrateur: si Jésus est le Messie, pourquoi son peuple ne l'a-t-il pas reconnu? En Luc 1–2, l'identité messianique de Jésus est également énoncée, mais par les messagers divins: Gabriel dit à Marie que Dieu donnera à l'enfant qui va naître «le trône de David son père» (Lc 1,32), et les anges de Bethléem annoncent aux bergers qu'un Sauveur leur est né, «qui est le Christ/Messie Seigneur» (Lc 2,11). Si l'identité messianique de Jésus est clairement énoncée en Matthieu 1–2 et Luc 1–2, c'est parce que ces deux récits suivent le modèle des *bioi* grecs, où l'origine (le γένος) véritable du protagoniste était et devait être établie dès le commencement <sup>21</sup>.

<sup>17</sup> Sous forme interrogative, Mt 12,23 («Celui-ci n'est-il pas le Fils de David?») semble être un hapax. L'appellation messianique sous forme de confession ne se trouve également que dans la bouche des aveugles de Mt 20,31; Mc 10,47; Lc 18,38.

<sup>18</sup> Explicitement en Mt 21,9, Lc 19,38 et Jn 12,13.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. Mt 20,21 / Mc 10,37.

<sup>20</sup> Le titre donné à Jésus par Nathanael, «Tu es le roi d'Israël» est messianique, comme le reconnaissent les commentateurs.

<sup>21</sup> Voir la démonstration en J.N. ALETTI, *Jésus, une vie à raconter*, ch. III et IV.



Les passages qui viennent d'être mentionnés autorisent à conclure que, dans les évangiles, les foules aussi bien que les disciples attendaient un Messie royal et glorieux, aucunement promis à la souffrance et au rejet. Mais le Jésus des évangiles accepte-t-il pour lui le titre de Messie?

## 2. *Jésus a-t-il déclaré être le Messie?*

Il a été noté plus haut que Jésus affirme plusieurs fois être prophète <sup>22</sup>. En revanche, si, eu égard à son identité messianique, sa réponse est positive et claire en Jean (4,24-25; 10,24-25), les propos du Jésus des Synoptiques restent obliques ou indirects avant sa Passion, la première personne du singulier, le 'je', étant absente de sa déclaration sur la *basileia* future du Fils de l'Homme <sup>23</sup> ou de ses propos sur le Messie fils de David et pourtant son Seigneur <sup>24</sup>; c'est seulement devant le Sanhédrin que ses réponses deviennent explicites et d'autant plus intéressantes qu'elles associent messianisme et gloire — et non souffrances ou rejet <sup>25</sup>.

Mais avant d'avancer dans notre argumentation, il importe de rappeler, sans les développer, les thèses selon lesquelles Jésus n'aurait jamais parlé de messianisme ou aurait refusé un titre qui ne lui convenait pas: la première thèse, connue sous le nom de secret messianique, fut échafaudée par Wrede au tout début du XX<sup>e</sup> à propos de l'évangile de Marc, et la deuxième, fut récemment défendue par P.Y. Brandt <sup>26</sup>. Selon Wrede, Jésus n'a pas parlé de messianisme et n'a donc pas demandé de le taire <sup>27</sup>. De qui viendrait alors le secret? De la première Église, Marc n'ayant fait que le reprendre et le développer pour donner une dimension messianique au Jésus de son récit. Depuis Wrede, la question du secret messianique s'est fortement déplacée, les analyses étant méthodologiquement bien plus sûres. Ce qu'il faut néanmoins retenir de la manière de faire de Marc, c'est la rétrojection opérée à partir de la Passion sur l'attitude de Jésus durant son ministère. Il devait y avoir une réelle cohérence entre l'attitude de Jésus durant sa Passion, calquée sur celles des justes persécutés, et celle qui avait dû auparavant être la sienne, toute de discrétion et d'humilité. En

<sup>22</sup> Cf. note 16.

<sup>23</sup> Cf. Mt 16,28; 19,28; 25,31; 26,64; Mc 14,62; Lc 21,27; 22,69.

<sup>24</sup> Mc 12,35-37 = Mt 22,41-45 = Lc 20,41-44.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. Mt 26,63-64 / Mc 14,61-62 / Lc 22,67-69.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. P.Y. BRANDT, *L'identité de Jésus et l'identité de son disciple*. Le récit de la transfiguration comme clef de lecture de l'Évangile de Marc (NTOA 50; Fribourg – Göttingen 2002).

<sup>27</sup> Dans ce qu'il est convenu d'appeler les injonctions au silence. Sur ces injonctions en Marc et sur leur fonction christologique, on consultera la thèse de S. DE VULPILLIÈRES, *Nature et fonction des injonctions au silence dans l'évangile de Marc* (EB NS 62; Pendé 2010). Cet ouvrage fournit aussi une longue présentation de la position de Wrede.

modifiant la formule de Martin Kähler (fin du XIX<sup>e</sup>), on dira que les épisodes dramatiques de sa Passion requéraient des épisodes antérieurs qu'ils présentent un Jésus humble, se tenant anonymement, dès le temps du baptême de Jean, au milieu des pécheurs pénitents, et refusant ensuite d'être loué pour ses actes de puissances (en grec, *dynameis*)<sup>28</sup>, un Jésus venu pour appeler les pécheurs et disant devoir souffrir et être rejeté. Le narrateur marcieen a ainsi voulu montrer qu'il y avait une réelle continuité entre les événements de la Passion et les décisions prises auparavant, durant le ministère. Bref, il est aujourd'hui admis que le récit de la Passion en Mc a en grande partie déterminé le choix et la dynamique des épisodes du ministère de Jésus.

La thèse de Brandt, qui a également pour objet l'évangile de Mc, renverse les termes du problème, car selon lui, ce n'est pas Jésus qui veut maintenir secret son être-messie, mais les autres personnages et le lecteur qui doivent éviter toute déclaration hâtive concernant son identité: «Le thème du silence qui s'égrené au fil du récit vient suspendre les conclusions hâtives que le lecteur pourrait être tenté de tirer en cours de lecture. Ce serait une manière de dire au lecteur: tu ne comprendras vraiment qui est Jésus qu'à la fin du récit, et tu ne comprendras vraiment ce que tu dis en affirmant qu'il est Fils de Dieu que lorsque tu le diras avec le centurion romain au pied de la croix (15,39)»<sup>29</sup>. Selon Brandt, ce sont les épisodes de la confession de Pierre et de la transfiguration qui aident le lecteur à retenir le seul titre qui convient à Jésus, celui de Fils de Dieu et non celui de Messie. Jésus refuse ce dernier titre que lui donne Pierre, puisqu'il ne le reprend pas et préfère une autre dénomination, celle de «Fils de l'Homme». En le nommant à la transfiguration «Fils bien-aimé», la voix céleste lui donne d'ailleurs raison: il est le Fils de Dieu; bref, en disant aux disciples de l'écouter, elle ratifie le choix de Jésus et confirme son autorité auprès des disciples. Toujours selon Brandt, la transfiguration a ainsi été placée à la suite de la confession de Pierre pour signifier la méprise de l'apôtre Pierre et, en contraste, la vérité de l'identité de Jésus énoncée par la voix divine. Sans examiner dans le détail cette lecture pour le moins stimulante<sup>30</sup>, disons que le Jésus de Marc confessera lui-même être le Messie en réponse à la demande du grand prêtre (Mc 14,62), et ce ne pourra être qu'une confession de sa véritable identité. S'il en est ainsi, les résistances de Jésus à accepter le titre durant son ministère ne doivent

<sup>28</sup> Sur la fonction narrative et christologique des injonctions au silence en Marc, voir S. DE VULPILLIÈRES, *Nature et fonction des injonctions*.

<sup>29</sup> P.-Y. BRANDT, *L'identité de Jésus*, 36.

<sup>30</sup> Pour une recension critique minutieuse de Brandt, on consultera S. DE VULPILLIÈRES, *Nature et fonction des injonctions*, 21-41.

pas être interprétées comme un refus du titre mais seulement des représentations que se faisaient du messianisme Pierre et les disciples; au titre de Messie que l'apôtre lui donne, «Jésus n'apporte aucun démenti ni aucune épanorthose, le silence qu'il demande doit être logiquement interprété comme celui qu'il a imposé auparavant aux démons, c'est-à-dire comme un refus de voir divulguée une caractérisation vraie, mais dangereuse, car liée à des représentations triomphalistes»<sup>31</sup>. C'est d'ailleurs lorsqu'il descend de la montagne de la transfiguration que Jésus donne aux disciples les raisons du silence à garder sur son identité et sur ce qu'ils ont vu de sa gloire: ils ne pourront et ne devront confesser sa messianité glorieuse qu'après sa résurrection (Mc 9,9-10).

Si Marc insiste davantage sur la consigne de silence concernant l'identité messianique de Jésus, ce n'est pas parce que Jésus refuserait de l'être, mais seulement parce qu'il juge les représentations de ses disciples trop hâtives. Cela dit, pour lui aussi, le Messie est une figure eschatologique et glorieuse, comme le montre sa réponse au grand-prêtre chez les Synoptiques. La question qui nous occupe n'a pourtant pas reçu de réponse. Si donc, même pour le Jésus des évangiles le Messie est une figure glorieuse et si ses coreligionnaires avaient la même attente, où trouver chez les prophètes l'annonce d'un Messie également souffrant?

### 3. *De Jésus Messie glorieux à Jésus Messie souffrant*

Que la résurrection de Jésus ait été l'événement par lequel les disciples ont compris qu'il était bien le Messie, parce que devenu glorieux, désormais associé à la seigneurie de Dieu, on l'acceptera d'autant plus que, dès ses premières lettres, pas plus de dix ou quinze ans après la mort/résurrection de Jésus, l'apôtre Paul lui donne le titre Christ/Messie et accole Χριστός à Ἰησοῦς sans avoir même besoin de dire ce qu'il fallait entendre par là<sup>32</sup>, comme si les croyants auxquels il s'adresse n'avaient pas/plus besoin qu'on le leur dise<sup>33</sup>. Il ne s'agit pas de revenir à l'époque où l'on se demandait si Jésus devint Messie par sa résurrection ou s'il l'était déjà et devint seulement Messie *glorieux* par elle, mais d'admettre que la résurrection a permis aux disciples de reconnaître et confesser la messianité *glorieuse* de Jésus en renvoyant principalement aux Psaumes<sup>34</sup>. La résurrection

<sup>31</sup> J.N. ALETTI, «La construction du personnage Jésus dans les récits évangéliques. Le cas de Mc» dans *Analyse narrative et Bible*. Deuxième colloque international du RRENAB. Louvain-la-Neuve – avril 2004 (éd. C. FOCANT – A. WÉNIN) (BETL 191; Leuven 2005) 19-42, 26.

<sup>32</sup> Cf. 1Th 1,1.3; 2,7.14; 3,2; 4,16; 5,9.18.23.28.

<sup>33</sup> Point fortement souligné par I.H. MARSHALL, "The Messiah in the First Century", 81.

<sup>34</sup> Cf. les Psaumes 2; 109/110; 131/132,11; etc.

confirmait et scellait l'itinéraire d'un Jésus fidèle et obéissant en tout à Dieu. Si la session glorieuse du Messie à la droite de Dieu ne résolvait pas l'énigme de sa mort ignominieuse en croix, elle montrait néanmoins qu'elle ne pouvait être contraire aux voies de Dieu. Voilà pourquoi les premiers disciples cherchèrent dans les Écritures d'éventuelles annonces et préfigurations de cette mort qui leur semblait indigne du Messie glorieux qu'était désormais Jésus. Les récits de la Passion montrent que leur lecture des Écritures ne fut pas stérile. Certes, la typologie qui en fut le résultat n'est pas de soi messianique: le Jésus décrit dans les récits de la Passion a en effet les traits des justes persécutés des supplications, des prophètes injustement mis à mort et de l'agneau pascal; mais elle permit de comprendre pourquoi Jésus, Messie glorieux, dut passer par la mort qui fut la sienne et pourquoi on put alors dire qu'il lui avait fallu souffrir et mourir rejeté avant d'entrer dans sa gloire. La typologie multiple des récits de la Passion donna ainsi à la figure du Messie une dimension que le seul titre de descendant davidique n'aurait pu lui donner. Grâce à elle, il était désormais possible d'annoncer que Jésus accomplissait toutes les Écritures.

#### CONCLUSION

Les réflexions qui précèdent ont eu pour objet premier de montrer que (i) la typologie n'a pu se développer qu'une fois le Messie Jésus entré dans sa gloire, mais qu'en retour (ii) elle a enrichi l'identité messianique de Jésus, en montrant qu'il portait à leur accomplissement les grandes figures des Écritures. Parallèlement, c'est une reconfiguration des attentes messianiques juives qui s'opérait: la glorification du Messie Jésus n'a pas fait disparaître le mal, les guerres et la souffrance, en d'autres termes, n'a pas été accompagnée par les temps messianiques qui étaient l'objet des attentes d'alors. Les premiers disciples ont dû répondre aux objections <sup>35</sup>, repenser l'eschatologie et montrer pourquoi il avait fallu que le Christ souffrît pour entrer dans sa gloire.

Institut Biblique Pontifical  
Via della Pilotta, 25  
00187 Rome

Jean-Noël ALETTI

<sup>35</sup> Cf. la réflexion récente de D. BANON, *L'attente messianique*. Une infinie patience (Paris 2012) 43: «La proclamation de l'avènement effectif du Christ-Messie non accompagnée des temps messianiques (le mal, la souffrance, les guerres, la faim, l'oppression et les injustices demeurent) ne suppose-t-elle pas un phénomène de spiritualisation idéaliste, potentiellement dangereux?»

## ABSTRACT

The aim of this article is to show (i) that Jesus' glorification was the condition *sine qua non* of the birth and development of the typology of the New Testament, and that (ii) the multiple typologies of the Gospels have enriched the messianic identity of Jesus, showing that he brought the major figures of the Scriptures of Israel to their fulfilment.

# WORDS THAT ARE PLOUGHSHARES: ANOTHER CASE OF (BILINGUAL) WORDPLAY IN BIBLICAL PROPHECY? <sup>1</sup>

## I. INTRODUCTION

The prophecy of future peace, in which swords shall be made into ploughshares and spears into pruning hooks, is one of the most famous passages in the Hebrew Bible. It was well known already in biblical times, as can be deduced from its double occurrence in the Hebrew Bible itself, among the prophecies of both Isaiah son of Amoz (Isa 2,4) and Micah the Morashite (Mic 4,3): **וכתו חרבותם לאתים וחניתותיהם למזמרות לא ישא גוי<sup>2</sup> אל גוי חרב ולא ילמדו עוד מלחמה** (And) they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more”. This powerful image is also found in reverse in the Book of Joel, where the nations and warriors are urged (Joel 4,10 [Vulgate and English translations: 3,10]): **כתו אתיכם לחרבות ומזמרתכם לרמחים**, “Beat your plowshares into swords, and your pruning hooks into spears”.

This paper advances the claim that this saying employs specific wartime weapons and agricultural tools within a wordplay, likely a bilingual one, within Hebrew rhetoric in the service of a prophetic message about the metamorphosis of war and peace <sup>3</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> I would like to thank Dr. Rachelle Gilmour for her helpful comments on an earlier version of this paper.

<sup>2</sup> The texts of Isa 2,4 and Mic 4,3 are almost identical in consonants in the MT, and the minor differences may result from changes in either oral or textual transmission of this prophetic message. For the first option, see, e.g., H.W. WOLFF, “Swords into Plowshares: Misuse of a Word of Prophecy?”, *The Meaning of Peace: Biblical Studies* (eds. P.B. YODER – W.M. SWARTLEY) (Louisville, KY 1992) 110-126, esp. 119. See also H.G.M. WILIAMSON, “Isaiah, Micah and Qumran”, *Semitic Studies in Honour of Edward Ullendorff* (ed. G. KHAN) (Studies in Semitic Languages and Linguistics 47; Leiden 2005) 203-211, for textual variations in Isa 2,2-4 in light of Mic 4,1-3 in Qumran scrolls of the Book of Isaiah, proving the fluidity of these two texts in the last centuries BCE. The English translation of both verses is identical. English translations in this paper are taken from NRSV.

<sup>3</sup> The term “peace” is used here as the equivalent of the Hebrew **שלום** with the meaning of a state where war is not waged and people may remain on their lands in safety (for **מלחמה**, “war”, and **שלום**, “peace” as opposites in the Hebrew Bible, see, e.g., Qoh 3,8). As acknowledged in scholarship, this is but one facet of this term: see, e.g., HALOT, 1506-1510; C. WESTERMANN, “Peace (Shalom) in the Old Testament”, *The Meaning of Peace*, 16-48; S. TALMON, “The Signification of **שלום** and Its Semantic Field”, *Literary Motifs*

Many cases of wordplay, of various types, have been identified in the Hebrew Bible <sup>4</sup>. Their vast prevalence in biblical prophetic texts has also been recognized <sup>5</sup>. One illuminating example occurs in Isa 5,7, where a wordplay with assonance is employed between opposites: God's hope for justice, **משפט**, *mišpāt*, and **צדקה**, *ṣēdākā*, is disappointed when confronted instead with **משפח**, *mispāḥ*, "bloodshed", and **צעקה**, *ṣē'ākā*, "cry of distress" <sup>6</sup>. In this case, each positive element is reversed to a similar sounding opposite in a manner that is likely aimed at expressing irony, as well as poetic justice, amplifying the prophet's reproof of his audience.

In addition to wordplays and puns within a single language, cases of bilingual wordplays have also been acknowledged in scholarship of ancient Near Eastern texts. Bilingual wordplays may be found, e.g., between Sumerian and Akkadian <sup>7</sup>, as well as cases of bilingual wordplays that involve Hebrew and another language, be it Aramaic, Akkadian, Egyptian, or Greek. Several such examples have been identified in the Hebrew Bible, specifically within biblical prophecy <sup>8</sup>.

*and Patterns in the Hebrew Bible: Collected Studies* (Winona Lake, IN 2013) 251-289 (for **שלום** as the antithesis of war, see esp. 273-289); and literature within both.

<sup>4</sup> For a definition and a discussion of "wordplay" in the Hebrew Bible, see V. KABERGS – H. AUSLOOS, "Paronomasia or Wordplay? A Babel-Like Confusion: Toward a Definition of Hebrew Wordplay", *Bib* 93 (2012) 1-20. See also I.M. CASANOWICZ, *Paronomasia in the Old Testament* (Boston, MA 1894 [= PhD Dissertation – Johns Hopkins University 1892; reprinted Jerusalem 1971]); J.M. SASSON, "Wordplay in the OT", *IDB Supplement Volume*, 968-970 (see p. 969 for some examples of wordplay involving the term **חרב**); E.L. GREENSTEIN, "Wordplay, Hebrew", *ABD* VI, 968-971; and cited literature.

<sup>5</sup> CASANOWICZ, *Paronomasia*, 41-42, and the tables on 93-94. For the use of wordplay in the Books of Isaiah and Micah and their eighth-century "prophetic milieu", see also R.B. CHISHOLM, "Wordplay in the Eighth-Century Prophets", *Bibliotheca Sacra* 144 (1987) 44-52; see esp. 49-50 for Isaiah and Micah using paronomasia for opposites with similar sounds.

<sup>6</sup> See, e.g., CHISHOLM, "Wordplay", 50; S. SCHORCH, "Between Science and Magic: The Function and Roots of Paronomasia in the Prophetic Books of the Hebrew Bible", *Pun and Pundits*. Word Play in the Hebrew Bible and Ancient Near Eastern Literature (ed. S.B. NOEGEL) (Bethesda, MD 2000) 205-222, esp. 220.

<sup>7</sup> See, e.g., A.D. KILMER, "More Word Play in Akkadian Poetic Texts", *Pun and Pundits*, 89-101, esp. 97-98.

<sup>8</sup> See P. MACHINIST, "Assyria and Its Image in the First Isaiah", *JAOS* 103 (1983) 719-737, esp. 734-735; G.A. RENDSBURG, "Bilingual Wordplay in the Bible", *VT* 38 (1988) 354-357; Id., "Word Play in Biblical Hebrew: An Eclectic Collection", *Puns and Pundits*, 137-162. See also, e.g., A. WINITZER, "Etana in Eden: New Light on the Mesopotamian and Biblical Tales in Their Semitic Context", *JAOS* 133 (2013) 441-465, esp. 451-455, 463-465; Id., "Assyriology and Jewish Studies in Tel Aviv: Ezekiel among the Babylonian *literati*", *Encounters by the Rivers of Babylon*. Scholarly Conversations Between Jews, Iranians and Babylonians in Antiquity (eds. U. GABBAY – S. SECUNDA) (Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism 160; Tübingen 2014) 163-216, esp. 173-176.



## II. SWORDS THAT ARE PLOUGHSHARES: SPECIALLY SELECTED TERMINOLOGY

The image in Isa 2,4, Mic 4,3 and Joel 4,10, which is possibly grounded in real life <sup>9</sup>, employs, within parallelism, two interchangeable pairs of tools. The tools in each pair are similarly made of metal, yet they represent functional opposites, used to symbolize a metamorphosis between contrasts: warfare and agriculture; wartime and peace.

The two pairs of weapons and agricultural tools are distinctive and do not mix: swords are paired with ploughshares, but never with pruning hooks, and the latter are coupled with either spears (Isa 2,4; Mic 4,3) or lances (Joel 4,10), but never with swords <sup>10</sup>. Although the pairs are interchangeable as pairs, their parts (i.e., their “A words” and “B words”) are not.

All these weapons and instruments were made of metal, and the process of making one into another is described as hammering or crushing into pieces <sup>11</sup>, which are later used to form the new tool. There seems to be no reason why a metal ploughshare (or the metal nails of a wooden ploughshare) could not be beaten down for making a spear or a lance, as well as a sword <sup>12</sup>. Moreover, other than the three verses under focus, biblical evidence of forging instruments of war out of, or into agricultural ones allows such a variety <sup>13</sup>. Therefore, another reason might be at work in this specific image.

<sup>9</sup> For the concept of beating down agricultural tools for making weapons, see 1 Sam 13,19-22. See also Hos 2,20; Zech 9,10; Pss 46,10; 76,4. In all these cases, it is God, not humans, who demolishes the weapons; see H. WILDBERGER, *Isaiah 1–12: A Commentary* (trans. T.H. TRAPP) (Continental Commentaries; Minneapolis, MN 1991) 93. For several Roman attestations of a similar practice of turning agricultural implements into weapons, see H.G.M. WILLIAMSON, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Isaiah 1–27* (ICC; London 2006) 186. See also Deut 20,6 for a literary expression of the custom of military recruits that took farmers from their lands at times of war.

<sup>10</sup> This is the case neither in these three verses nor elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible. Interestingly, in Targum Jonathan (henceforth: TJ) for Isa 18,5, מְזַמְרֹת, “pruning hooks” in the prophetic metaphor is translated exegetically as חֶרֶבָא, “sword”.

<sup>11</sup> For the verb *k-t-t*, see BDB, 510; HALOT, 507.

<sup>12</sup> For weapons, their shape and mode of operation in ancient Israel, see, e.g., Y. YADIN, *The Art of Warfare in Biblical Lands in Light of Archaeological Discovery* (trans. M. PEARLMAN) (Jerusalem 1963) 6-15. On ploughs in ancient Mesopotamia, see also, e.g., B. HRUŠKA, “Pflug. A. In Mesopotamien”, *RIA* X, 510-514; U. SEIDL, “Pflug. B. Archäologisch”, *RIA* X, 514-516 (note pp. 515-516 in regard to the plough as a symbol for both agricultural and military aspects of the god Ningirsu/Ninurta); D.T. POTTS, *Mesopotamian Civilization. The Material Foundation* (Athlone Publications in Egyptology and Ancient Near Eastern Studies; London 1997) 70-86.

<sup>13</sup> See references in note 9 above.

The first pair of weapon and agricultural tool posits a transformation of swords, Hebrew: **הַרְבֹּת**, *hārābôt* (sg. **הָרֵב**; *hereb*), and ploughshares, Hebrew: **אַתִּים**, *’ittîm* (sg. **אֵת**, *ēt*). The juxtaposition of these two terms within a single saying calls attention to the evidence from Semitic languages, in which the root *h-r-b* may (also) mean “plough”, a specific type of plough, or a component of a plough. Therefore, it is suggested here that the saying under discussion was coined with both meanings of *h-r-b* in mind, the common “sword”, but also the rare “plough”. The choice of pairing the **הרֵב** with the plough might intentionally augment the straightforward meaning of changing a sword into a ploughshare, with an additional meaning of changing one type of plough into another.

The evidence regarding the root *h(h)-r-b* from pertinent Semitic languages will now be presented, to be followed by a short inquiry into the meaning of this wordplay.

### 1. Rabbinic Hebrew

A single case is found in Rabbinic Hebrew: *m. Kel.* 21,2 reads that “[one who] touched the handle (**הרֵב**), knee beam or cross-piece [of a plough], he becomes impure”<sup>14</sup>. The term **הרֵב** is understood here, as in the discussion of this passage in the *Tosefta* (*t. Kel. Bat.* 1,7) as “the sword-shaped (wooden) handle of a plough”<sup>15</sup>.

This single use in Rabbinic Hebrew is unique and is not supported in earlier Biblical Hebrew. In the majority of its circa 400 occurrences in the Hebrew Bible, the noun **הרֵב** denotes “sword”, and only in rare instances does it appear as a general term for a metal object (e.g., Exod 20,25; Ezek 26,9; 2 Chr 34,6 [q]). This evidence may not support the specific use of this term as related to “plough” in the Biblical Hebrew, nor is it enough to establish the single Mishnaic attestation. However, the evidence does make more likely a common Semitic background for this meaning of **הרֵב**<sup>16</sup>, and it strengthens the notion that if this meaning was known in late eighth-century Israel and Judah<sup>17</sup>, as suggested here, it came into the

<sup>14</sup> English translation taken from Project Sefaria (accessed 11/2/2017).

<sup>15</sup> M. JASTROW, *A Dictionary of the Targumim, The Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature*. 2 vols. (New York 1950 [1903]) I, 498, meaning 2. See also E. BEN YEHUDA, *A Complete Dictionary of Ancient and Modern Hebrew*. 17 vols. (Tel Aviv 1948-1959) III, 1732-1734. Ben Yehuda suggests that this meaning of the Hebrew noun **הרֵב** might have preceded the more common “sword” (*ibid.*, 1734).

<sup>16</sup> Otto Kaiser suggests such a Semitic common root for the Hebrew **הרֵב** and the Akkadian *harbu*, designating a type of plough: O. KAISER, “**הָרֵב** *hereb*; **הָרַב** *hārab* II”, *TDOT*, V, 155. On this Akkadian term see more below.

<sup>17</sup> For the Neo-Assyrian background and terminology in Isa 2,1-3 see P. ARTZI, “‘All the Nations and Many Peoples’: The Answer of Isaiah and Micah to Assyrian Imperial

knowledge of (some) Hebrew speakers from another Semitic language<sup>18</sup>. For this period, the most likely candidate is Aramaic<sup>19</sup>.

## 2. Aramaic

The Aramaic term **חרבא**, like its Hebrew semantic equivalent **חרב**, most commonly occurs with the meaning “sword”, yet it is clearly also attested in Syriac with the meaning “plough” or “nails of a plough” in the Peshittā [henceforth: Pesh] for Sir 38,25 and Luke 9,62<sup>20</sup>.

It is true that all the examples presented above, both in Hebrew and Aramaic, are later than biblical writings and Biblical Hebrew by several centuries<sup>21</sup>. Nevertheless, when brought together, they help to substantiate the existence of the Semitic root *h-r-b* with the meaning “plough”. As the Aramaic evidence for this second meaning is better substantiated than the Hebrew one, it is more likely that the wordplay under investigation indeed carries a bilingual aspect. Establishing its existence centuries earlier, in the first half of the first millennium BCE, is supported by a third linguistic player: Akkadian.

Policies”, *Treasures on Camels’ Humps*. Historical and Literary Studies from the Ancient Near East Presented to Israel Eph’al (eds. M. COGAN – D. KAHN) (Jerusalem 2008) 41-53. See also, e.g., J.J.M. ROBERTS, “Isaiah 2 and the Prophet’s Message to the North”, *JQR* 75 (1985) 290-308. As this saying’s immediate context in Isaiah 2 goes back to the second half of the eighth century BCE, so must be the saying’s *terminus ante quem* (for the relative chronological and literary relation between the three attestations of this saying, see references in note 33 below).

<sup>18</sup> Note also the prophetic context of many nations (Isa 4,2-3//Mic 2,1-2; see also Joel 4,9.11-12), which could have inspired a concept of many languages, and, thus, complements the enhancement of the message by a bilingual wordplay. See Machinist (“Assyria and its Image”) and Rendsburg (“Bilingual Wordplay”, 356; “Word Play”, 141-142) for similarly reasoned discussions of Akkadian, Egyptian and Aramaic contexts that display examples of possible Hebrew-Akkadian, Hebrew-Egyptian and Hebrew-Aramaic (respectively) bilingual wordplays.

<sup>19</sup> The prevalence of Aramaic in the first millennium BCE makes it plausible that the attestation in Rabbinic Hebrew might also be traced back to Aramaic.

<sup>20</sup> **ܫܚܒܐ ܕܚܪܒܐ**, literally “the plough’s sword” (cf. **ܫܚܒܐ ܕܚܪܒܐ** [Pesh Isa 2,4=Mic 4,3; Joel 4,10], literally “ploughs’ nails”). See R. PAYNE SMITH, *Thesaurus Syriacus* (Oxford 1879) 1365; J. PAYNE SMITH, *A Compendious Syriac Dictionary* (Founded upon the *Thesaurus Syriacus* of R. Payne Smith) (Oxford 1903) 156; M. SOKOLOFF, *A Syriac Lexicon* (Winona Lake, IN 2009) 486. See also U. SEIDEL, “Studien zum Vokabular der Landwirtschaft im Syrischen I”, *Altorientalische Forschungen* 15 (1988) 133-173, esp. 162.

<sup>21</sup> This also holds true for the possible resurfacing of a related meaning of the Semitic root *h-r-b* in Maghreb Arabic: see D. COHEN et al., *Dictionnaire des racines sémitiques ou attestées dans les langues sémitiques*. 10 vols. (Leuven 1970-2012) X, 1021-1022.

### 3. The Akkadian Contribution

The Akkadian term *ḥarbu* (pl. *ḥarbū*) designates a type of plough<sup>22</sup>. It is well documented in Old Babylonian, Middle Babylonian and New Assyrian; in other words, in texts of both the second and first millennia BCE. Unlike the Aramaic or Hebrew terms discussed above, Akkadian *ḥarbu* does not have the meaning of “sword”<sup>23</sup>.

In fact, the data from Akkadian might bring forth the intriguing possibility that the wordplay in the saying under question originated in the Akkadian term *ḥarbu*, rather than Aramaic חרבא<sup>24</sup>. This Akkadian scenario, although not without its difficulties, is made more appealing by the recognition that, unlike Aramaic (or Hebrew), Akkadian may also allow a similar bilingual wordplay in the second part of the weapons and agricultural tools saying.

The second pair of weapon and agricultural tool pairs together מְזֻמְרוֹת, *mazmērôt*, widely accepted to mean “pruning hooks/knives”<sup>25</sup>, with its weapon counterparts: either חֲנִיתוֹת, *ḥānītôt* (sg. חֲנִית, *ḥānīt*; Isa 2,4 and Mic 4,3), or רִמָּחִים, *rēmāḥîm* (sg. רִמָּח, *rōmaḥ*; Joel 4,10). The first term is usually understood to mean “spear” and the second one “lance”, although this distinction is not discrete. Not only are the spear and the lance similar weapons<sup>26</sup>, but *rōmaḥ* may connote both “spear” and “lance” in Biblical

<sup>22</sup> AHw, I, 325 (s.v. *ḥarbu(m)* II); CAD, H, 97-98. Note also the terms *epinnu*, which has the general meaning of “plough” (AHw, I, 229; CAD, E, 235-237), and *ittû(m)*, “seeding apparatus of the plow” (CAD, I-J, 312, s.v. *ittû* B; see also AHw, I, 406), a likely semantic cognate of the Hebrew אֵת (e.g., WILDBERGER, *Isaiah 1-12*, 93).

<sup>23</sup> Moreover, Akkadian terms for “sword”, *naṣṣaru(m)* and *patru(m)*, do not resemble by assonance their Hebrew equivalent. On these terms, see CAD, N1, 246; P, 279-284; AHw, II, 729, 848 (respectively). See also KAISER, “*ḥereḥ*”, 162, on the similar use of Hebrew חֶרֶב and Akkadian *patrum*, regarding a divine sword of judgment. The term *ḥarbu(m)* is possibly involved in an (inner-)Akkadian wordplay in “The Theogony of Dunnu”, as suggested by T. JACOBSEN, *The Harab Myth* (SANE 2/3; Malibu, CA 1984), esp. 5 (n. 1), 21, and 23; see also, e.g., W.W. HALLO, “The Theogony of Dunnu [1.112]”, *The Context of Scripture*. Vol. 1: Canonical Composition from the Biblical World (Leiden 1997) 402-403. This reading, however, has been disputed by W.G. LAMBERT, *Babylonian Creation Myths* (Mesopotamian Civilizations 16; Winona Lake, IN 2013) 39.

<sup>24</sup> This does not eliminate the possibility that the Akkadian term might have been mediated to Hebrew via Aramaic.

<sup>25</sup> The sg. form מְזֻמְרָה, *mazmērā*, does not occur in MT. See BDB, 275; DCH, V, 210. See also HALOT, 566: “wine-dresser’s knife”.

<sup>26</sup> The lance, or the javelin, is longer and heavier than the spear: see, e.g., M. COGAN, *Joel: Introduction and Commentary* (Mikra LeYisra’el; Tel Aviv – Jerusalem 1994) 55 (Heb.). See also S.H. BANG, “For Whom the Plowshares and Pruning Hooks Toil: A Tradition-Historical Reading of Joel 4.10”, *JSOT* 39 (2015) 489-512, esp. 506-507. This adds to the understanding that in modern times and languages, as in biblical ones, the terms for spear, lance and javelin were interchangeable to some degree.

Hebrew <sup>27</sup>. For this pair, we may introduce into the discussion the Akkadian term *azmarû* (pl. *azmarû* or *azmarânû*) understood as either “lance” or “spear” <sup>28</sup>. Thus, the saying under discussion might speak of turning (Akkadian) *azmarû* into (Hebrew) *mazmērôt*, playing on assonance and the common root *z-m-r*, which has the meaning of “spear/lance” in Akkadian, although not in Aramaic, nor in Hebrew <sup>29</sup>.

However, as said above, this idea, although elegant, raises some questions that need to be addressed. First, it presupposes a Judean knowledge of Akkadian weaponry terms — the term for spear/lance that derives from *z-m-r* — in addition to agricultural ones <sup>30</sup>. However, to date, only very common words and terms relating to imperial ideology, such as “king” and “official” (Akkadian *šarru*, “king”, and *malku*, “counselor”, with the Hebrew *melek*, “king” and *šār*, “subordinate official”) have been recognized within references to the Assyrians and in Hebrew-Akkadian

<sup>27</sup> See BDB, 333, for חנית as “spear”, and 942, for רמח as both “spear” and “lance”. See also the Aramaic רומחא (Syriac: ܪܘܡܚܐ) that may stand for either “spear” or “lance”, and is used as a translation equivalent for חנית (as well as for רמח) in both TJ and Pesh. For חנית see Pesh of Isa 2,4 and, e.g., 2 Sam 23,18.21 (= 1 Chr 11,20.23); 1 Chr 11,11; 2 Chr 23,9 (see also 2 Sam 23,7; Job 39,23); TJ of 1 Sam 13,19 (but compare with v. 22). For רמח see, e.g., Num 25,7; 1 Kgs 18,28 (both TJ and Pesh); Jer 46,4 (Pesh). See also the various English translations offered in the dictionaries: JASTROW, *Dictionary*, II, 1461; M. SOKOLOFF, *A Dictionary of Jewish Babylonian Aramaic of the Talmudic and Geonic Periods* (Ramat Gan – Baltimore, MD 2002) 1066; ID., *A Dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic of the Byzantine Period* (Ramat Gan – Baltimore, MD 2002) 525; ID., *A Syriac Lexicon*, 1450.

<sup>28</sup> CAD, A2, 527-528. See also *azamrûtu*, in CAD, A2, 525-526; *zamru(m)*, in AHw, III, 1509. This term also occurs with the form *alismarû* (AHw, I, 75) that, although connected to the root *z-m-r*, does not explicitly reflect it (see CAD, A2, 528, for the preference of reading it with a “z”), as well as two peculiar and possibly erroneous occurrences *azzamû* and *armarû* (see CAD, A2, *ibid.*).

<sup>29</sup> See, e.g., JASTROW, *Dictionary*, II, 75; SOKOLOFF, *Dictionary of Jewish Babylonian Aramaic*, 417; ID., *Dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic*, 179; ID., *Syriac Lexicon*, 386-387. On the Hebrew root *z-m-r*, see, recently, N. MIZRAHI, “Textual Criticism through the Prism of Historical Linguistics: The Case of Biblical Hebrew *z-m-r*”, *From Author to Copyist. Essays on the Composition, Redaction, and Transmission of the Hebrew Bible in Honor of Zippi Talshir* (ed. C. WERMAN) (Winona Lake, IN 2015) 201-222. There are grounds for accepting the possibility that both Hebrew *ḥānîṭôt* and *rēmāḥîm* might reflect equivalent references to a single foreign (Akkadian) word. This provides the warrant for recognizing that they are textually interchangeable in the Hebrew Bible, at least to a certain extent, and that the use of both within the “Swords to Ploughshares” saying might reflect two existing versions of this saying, both acknowledging that the counterpart of *mazmērôt* is a Hebrew term for *azmarû*, be it *ḥānîṭôt* or *rēmāḥîm*.

<sup>30</sup> It could theoretically be claimed that Judeans may have recognized the term חרב as standing (also) for “plough”, as coming from Aramaic, and only needed Akkadian for its term for “spear/lance”. However, this would make this saying a combination of two bilingual wordplays, each with a different language, that is, a complex and unique — and thus, even less probable — case of a tri-lingual wordplay.

wordplays in the Hebrew Bible <sup>31</sup>. Although the Assyrian army was present in eighth-century BCE Judah, and the Assyrian empire collected agricultural taxes, which would make for a plausible scenario for Judeans to have been exposed to terms for weapons and agricultural tools, the claim advanced here suggests a terminological knowledge that goes deeper than anything proven until now.

To sum up this section: the prophetic saying speaking of a future metamorphosis between swords and ploughshares, and spears/lances and pruning hooks, likely employs a wordplay. This wordplay is manifested in the choice of the specific terms that are paired together, specifically the ploughshare with the sword, the term for which has an equivalent meaning of “plough”. While improbable in eighth-century BCE Hebrew, this wordplay is much more likely to be bilingual, involving terms in Aramaic, or even Akkadian.

#### 4. *Meaning and Function: Reversal and the Prophetic Message*

This bilingual wordplay offers an additional layer to the saying’s explicit message of transformation between war and peace. It suggests that the grand metamorphosis expected in the future is, in effect, not much of a metamorphosis at all: the swords to be transformed into (or from) ploughs are simultaneously their functional opposites, and hold an intrinsic “ploughness”. On the face of it, this second-tier, implicit or hidden message fully contradicts the first-tier, explicit meaning of a reversal of opposites, but that is not necessarily the case. In equating the swords and the ploughs, this wordplay actually supports and increases the probability that such metamorphoses might take place; perhaps even more so, it may suggest that these metal instruments have an inherent capacity for this metamorphosis. In Joel’s calling for war, it could express the idea that only a thin line separates war and peace, and a peaceful existence is temporary and may easily and rapidly turn into war; and in Isaiah’s and Micah’s prophecy, it may serve the prophetic message in assuring the audience that the future cessation of war is even more feasible and, therefore, closer than they might think.

Therefore, this wordplay serves for more than just aesthetics, and is not a mere “play” on words. Rather, it is a rhetoric device, enhancing the prophetic message <sup>32</sup>, revolving around the theme of reversal of war and

<sup>31</sup> See, e.g., MACHINIST, “Assyria and Its Image”. See also RENDSBURG, “Bilingual Wordplay”; ID., “Word Play”.

<sup>32</sup> On the exegetical function of puns and their contribution to the understanding and interpretation of prophetic messages, see CHISHOLM, “Wordplay”, 45; SCHORCH, “Between Science and Magic”, 207, 211-217.

peace. Reversal also plays a part in this saying's inner-biblical reception history. At least one of the prophets is deliberately overturning the words of an existing saying known to his audience. In other words, if, as is commonly accepted, Joel is reusing a prophecy of Isaiah and/or Micah <sup>33</sup>, then the reversal of this earlier saying, and the image it portrays, are part of his message of a complete transformation of not only the present state, but also existing conceptions built upon earlier prophecies.

In fact, the three biblical occurrences of this saying display two, or even three, reversals: first is the metamorphosis between tools of war and those of peace in the original message; and later, the reversal of the message by the prophet who turned the direction 180 degrees <sup>34</sup>. A third plane of reversal is added by the bilingual wordplay, which, for those who recognize it, reverses the state of opposition between the two types of tools by greatly narrowing the gap between them.

### III. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The biblical saying about the transformation of weapons of war into (or from) peaceful agricultural tools, made famous already in biblical times, quite plausibly conceals a bilingual wordplay. The parallelism of the pair

<sup>33</sup> Studies of this biblical image have addressed the question of which of the three prophets was the first to use this saying. For discussions that prefer the "peaceful" variation of the saying (Isaiah/Micah) over the "call for arms" (Joel), see, e.g., KAISER, "*hereb*", 160; WILLIAMSON, *Isaiah 1–27*, 185–186. Already Kimhi (on Joel 4,10) addressed this issue by claiming that Joel is speaking of war, after which will come the peace prophesized by Isaiah, where the swords that have been forged from (everyday) tools would again be reverted into ploughshares. The idea of a recurring cycle of swords and ploughshares being transformed back and forth one into each other, rather than a one-way transformation, is striking. For similar perspectives see also WILDBERGER, *Isaiah 1–12*, 93–94; J. LIMBURG, "Swords to Plowshares: Text and Contexts", *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah, I* (eds. C.C. BROYLES – C.A. EVANS) (VTS 70/1; Leiden 1997) 279–293, esp. 279–289. The traditional view of the Latter Days' prophecy has it delivered twice, by each of the two prophets. A short discussion of options is offered by S.D. LUZZATTO, *Il Profeta Isaia: volgarizzato e commentato ad uso degli'Israeliti* (Padova 1867 [1855]) 45–46 (Heb.). For the comparison of Isa 2,2–4 and Mic 2,1–3, a survey of scholarship, and discussion, see, e.g., WILDBERGER, *Isaiah 1–12*, 83–87; D.R. HILLERS, *Micah* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia, PA 1984) 51–53; R. MÜLLER, "Doubled Prophecy: The Pilgrimage of the Nations in Mic 4:1–5 and Isa 2:1–5", *Changes in Scripture. Rewriting and Interpreting Authoritative Traditions in the Second Temple Period* (eds. H. VON WEISSENBERG – J. PAKKALA – M. MARTILA) (BZAW 419; Berlin 2011) 177–191; and Y. (I.) PELEG, "Two Readings of the Vision of Peace at the End of Days: Isaiah 2:2–5 and Micah 4:1–5", *Shnaton* 20 (2010) 27–50 (Heb.).

<sup>34</sup> This reversal exists whether or not the audience of this secondary use (or even the person responsible for this secondary use, whether the prophet or a later scribe who incorporated the saying in prophetic writing) was aware of the bilingual aspect of the saying.



“sword — ploughshare” (and possibly also “spear/lance — pruning hook”) presents an intentional coupling of specific weapons and agricultural tools: it brings together two Hebrew terms, one of which has another meaning (or a homonym) in a foreign Semitic language with the meaning of its Hebrew counterpart <sup>35</sup>.

The evocative image of the known practice of turning agricultural tools into weapons, and the less common, but much more desired, counter-transformation of weapons into instruments of peacetime agriculture, may now be considered a likely member of the group of bilingual wordplays in the Hebrew Bible. This bilingual wordplay equips the saying and the prophecies in which it occurs with a new stratum of meaning that strengthens and makes more plausible the initial image of a future metamorphosis between war and peace.

The Hebrew University of Jerusalem  
Mt. Scopus  
Jerusalem 9190501 (Israel)  
shira.golani@mail.huji.ac.il

Shira J. GOLANI

#### SUMMARY

This paper discusses the image of swords made into ploughshares and spears into pruning hooks, or vice versa, in Isaiah 2,4, Micah 4,3 and Joel 4,10. It advances the suggestion that this image presents a wordplay, most likely a bilingual one, manifested in the choice of specific weapons and agricultural tools to be paired together. This rhetorical device adds a new level of meaning to the prophetic message, enhancing the theme of metamorphosis and reversal of the prophecies in which this image occurs. This case would belong with other examples of bilingual wordplay already acknowledged in the Hebrew Bible.

<sup>35</sup> In all three occurrences of this saying, and possibly unaware of the bilingual wordplay in the original Hebrew, TJ has its own wordplay, using alliteration between each pair of weapons and agricultural tools. Thus, e.g., TJ of Isa 2,4 reads: וְעִפְפֹּן סִיפֵיהֶן לְסִיכִין, וּמִוֶּרֶחַתָּהֶן לְמַגִּלִּין, “they shall bend their swords into ploughshares, and their lances [or: spears] into sickles”. The choice of the specific agricultural tools, such as translating the Hebrew מִזְמוֹרוֹת by מַגִּלִּין, usually understood as “sickles” (rather than “pruning hooks”; see, e.g., SOKOLOFF, *Dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic*, 290), to go with מִוֶּרֶחַן, “spear, lance” (ibid., 296), seems to reflect an intentional double alliteration.

## THE DIFFICULTY OF ΜΟΝΟΓΕΝΗΣ ΘΕΟΣ IN JOHN 1,18: A REASSESSMENT

Two decades ago the prevailing view among scholars and translators of the NT was that the adjective μονογενής in John 1,14.18; 3,16.18 and 1 John 4,9 signifies “only” or “single”. Contrary to the consensus, several interpreters have argued the case for interpreting the adjective as “only begotten” <sup>1</sup>. On the basis of a thorough study of the use of μονογενής in Greek literature, I will argue that in the Johannine writings the term μονογενής means, in most cases, “unique”, “only”, or “single”. This sense of the term finds its origin in developments in Christology, which do not antedate the second century AD <sup>2</sup>. On the other hand, this sense best suits the contexts of the term’s occurrence in John as well.

It is proposed that usage rather than etymology is the best criterion for resolving the issue of the meaning of μονογενής in the Gospel of John. Of great importance is the use of the term in the Prologue of the Gospel: “there is widespread agreement that this prologue is ultimately about the enfleshment or, perhaps more theologically, the incarnation and public appearance of the *logos* as human being, Jesus Christ” <sup>3</sup>. But, at the present time, no consensus exists on the exact structure of John 1,1-18 <sup>4</sup>, with more and more interpreters acknowledging that the Prologue’s comprehensive framework parallels ancient Jewish Wisdom hymns <sup>5</sup>. The purpose of this article is to explore the intended meaning and function of v. 18 as the final declaration in the Prologue.

Most scholars agree that v. 17 and v. 18 are from the same hand, noting the obvious stylistic, conceptual, and verbal similarities between the

<sup>1</sup> See M. THEOBALD, *Die Fleischwerdung des Logos* (Münster 1988) 250-254; J.V. DAHMS, “The Johannine Use of Monogenes Reconsidered”, *NTS* 29 (1983) 222-232.

<sup>2</sup> DAHMS, “The Johannine Use”, 223.

<sup>3</sup> S.E. PORTER, *John, His Gospel, and Jesus*. In Pursuit of the Johannine Voice (Grand Rapids, MI 2015) 89.

<sup>4</sup> E. HARRIS, *Prologue and Gospel*. The Theology of the Fourth Evangelist (London 1994) 92: “As a climax to a literary form known as prologue, and which, it has been argued previously, functions as a true prologue, v. 18 can be expected to contain something which, while it may return to certain earlier statements in the prologue, may also introduce something new that is crucial for the correct understanding of the rest of the Gospel”.

<sup>5</sup> C.M. PATE, *The Writings of John*. A Survey of the Gospel, Epistles and Apocalypse (Grand Rapids, MI 2011) 47. The hymnic texts are the following: Prov 8,22-25; Wis 9,9-12; and Sir 24,5-27.

Prologue and the rest of the Gospel, which emerged from the so-called Johannine Community <sup>6</sup>. In this article, however, we will focus primarily on John 1,18 and the problematic meaning of μονογενής θεός. Interpreters dispute the meaning of μονογενής. Some follow the traditional translation “only begotten”, while others object that this is not a sound etymological reading of the term <sup>7</sup>.

This issue is even more critical in view of the fact that v. 18 serves a dual objective. In the first place, it acts as a climax to the entire Prologue. Secondly, it also acts within the Prologue itself as the climax of the testimony of John in vv. 15-18 <sup>8</sup>. Before examining the usage of this term and its contested meaning in the Gospel of John, it will be necessary to consider briefly the etymology of the term μονογενής.

### I. THE ETYMOLOGY OF THE TERM μονογενής

The term μονογενής is derived from the adjective μόνος -η -ον and the noun stem γενής, from γένος which ranges in meaning from “race, kin” to “type, kind, unique”. The claim that γενής always signifies some type of “derivation” is contradicted by its combination with the adjective μόνος, as well as by the fact that even in the earliest Greek literature γένος is used without reference to derivation <sup>9</sup>.

Among early Christian writers the use of μονογενής was accepted. For instance, Clement of Alexandria <sup>10</sup> applies the adjective to the letter *iota*, which represents the number ten, and so points to the name “Jesus”. Eusebius <sup>11</sup> uses it in connection with an enormous church built by Constantine in Antioch. And Clement of Rome <sup>12</sup> describes the phoenix as μονογενής (“unique”). In this case, the possible meaning “only-derived” is excluded by the many passages in Greek and Roman literature in which the phoenix’s uniqueness is noted <sup>13</sup>. It is clear, then, that also Christian

<sup>6</sup> M. C. DE BOER, “The Original Prologue to the Gospel of John”, *NTS* 61 (2015) 455.

<sup>7</sup> C.S. KEENER, *The Gospel of John. A Commentary* (Peabody, MA 2003) 1.412-413: “‘Only begotten’ fails the etymology test, as it would require a different word, μονογενετός; μονογενής derives instead from a different root, γένος, leading to the meaning ‘one of a kind’”.

<sup>8</sup> A.J. KOSTENBERGER – B.L. MERKLE – R.L. PLUMMER, *Going Deeper with New Testament Greek. An Intermediate Study of the Grammar and Syntax of the New Testament* (Nashville, TN 2016) 49.

<sup>9</sup> HARRIS, *Prologue and Gospel*, 18.

<sup>10</sup> CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA, *Paed.* 3.12.89.

<sup>11</sup> EUSEBIUS, *Vit. Const.* 3.50.2.

<sup>12</sup> CLEMENT OF ROME, *1 Clem.* 25.2.

<sup>13</sup> G. PENDRIX, “ΜΟΝΟΓΕΝΗΣ”, *NTS* 41 (1995) 590.

authors could use μονογενής in the sense of “unique” without any suggestion of the idea of “birth” or “derivation”.

Because of these attested uses of μονογενής in ancient sources, many scholars continue to debate its intended meaning in the Prologue <sup>14</sup>. For many centuries, John’s Prologue has been widely viewed as difficult to comprehend, and scholars continue to be baffled by its structure and meaning <sup>15</sup>. Despite the simplicity of the language, the meaning conveyed by the Prologue is far from simple. What is clear to nearly all students of John’s Gospel, however, is that no part can be understood in isolation from the whole.

The uses of μονογενής in the LXX has been examined extensively by others, and need not be treated in detail here. Suffice it to say that not a single passage in the LXX requires the interpretation “only-born” or “only-begotten”. To the contrary, in the LXX μονογενής means “only/single” (Judg 11,34; Tob 3,15; 6,11; 8,17), or “unique” (Pss 21,21; 34,17), or even “solitary” (Ps 24,16), rendering the Hebrew *yahid* <sup>16</sup>. In the New Testament, μονογενής occurs nine times. In Heb 11,7 the term is applied to Isaac, even though, as is well known, at the time in question Abraham had also fathered Ishmael. In all probability, this passage reflects a Greek translation of the OT in which the term *yahid* in Gen 22,2.12.16 was translated with μονογενής <sup>17</sup>. In any case, the adjective cannot in this instance carry any connotation of “derivation”.

Furthermore, in classical Greek, μονογενής is applied to a wide range of entities other than human beings in the sense of “only one of its kind” or “unique”. For example, the Hellenistic author, Galen, characterizes the liver as a “unique” organ <sup>18</sup>. The commentator on Aristotle, John Philoponus, asserts that the heavenly bodies are “unique”. According to Theophrastus, the beech tree (δξύη), the yew (μίλος) and the alder (κλήθρα) are each μονογενής (“the only one of its kind”) <sup>19</sup>. In the *Timaeus*, Plato characterizes the universe as “unique” <sup>20</sup>.

<sup>14</sup> PORTER, *John, His Gospel*, 89-90.

<sup>15</sup> E. HAENCHEN, *John 1. A Commentary on the Gospel of John, Chapters 1-6* (Philadelphia, PA 1984) 101.

<sup>16</sup> P. WINTER, “μονογενής παρὰ πατρός”, *ZRGG* 5 (1953) 335-365. See also R. SCHNACKENBURG, *The Gospel according to St. John*. 3 vols. (New York 1980-1982) 183. In connection with Hebrew *yahid*, μονογενής in some of these passages bears the additional connotation of “especially beloved”.

<sup>17</sup> WINTER, “μονογενής”, 337-338.

<sup>18</sup> GALEN, *De plac.* 6.8.31.

<sup>19</sup> THEOPHRASTUS, *Hist. plant.* 3.10.1-2; 3.14.3.

<sup>20</sup> PLATO, *Timaeus* 31A8-B3.

Additionally, according to M. Theobald<sup>21</sup>, the parallelism of μονογενής with κατὰ τὴν μόνωσιν demonstrates the sense in which the adjective is to be understood. When μονογενής is used in the sense of “unique”, there is no implication of birth or derivation. This is evident from the earliest instance of this usage by Parmenides, who speaks of “being” as μονογενής<sup>22</sup>. It is obvious, however, that the adjective here cannot contain even the slightest hint of the idea of birth or derivation but should signify “the only thing of its kind” or “unique”<sup>23</sup>. This evidence, however, constitutes a serious problem for the exegesis of John 1,18, which has received little attention from the commentators who overlook the fact that even early Christian writers used μονογενής in the sense of “unique” without any hint of the idea of birth or derivation.

Another frequently raised question is why Jesus is given the title “Son of God” in John 1,1 (cf. 20,28) and then also called “the One and Only God” (μονογενής θεός) in John 1,18<sup>24</sup>. With regard to John 1,1, Witherington observes: “[H]ere, as in Rom 9:5, θεός occurs without the definite article, which emphasizes the generic side of things (the *logos* is of the *genus* or species called θεός). The word order and structure in the Greek of the first verse are such that the translation ‘the word was a god’ is surely inappropriate”<sup>25</sup>. In fact, θεός without the article is certainly the predicate of the sentence. On the one hand, it emphasizes the kind of being the Word is, or the Word’s true nature, rather than the Word’s personal identity. On the other hand, it also makes clear that the Word does not exhaust the Godhead<sup>26</sup>. In other words, the reverse proposition would not be valid: “God was the Word”, in the sense that “the Word was all there is to God”<sup>27</sup>. There are several readings of John 1,11 in the ancient manuscripts with the predicate appearing either as “Son” (υἱός) or as “God” (θεός)<sup>28</sup>. D. Moody Smith asserts that, “the oldest manuscripts read θεός (P<sup>66</sup> P<sup>75</sup> B and others). It is also the more difficult reading in that one

<sup>21</sup> THEOBALD, *Die Fleischwerdung*, 251.

<sup>22</sup> L. TARAN, *Parmenides*. Text with Translation, Commentary, and Critical Essays (Princeton, NJ 1965) 92-93.

<sup>23</sup> PENDRIX, “MONOGENΗΣ”, 589.

<sup>24</sup> HARRIS, *Prologue and Gospel*, 92. See also A.J. KÖSTENBERGER, *Encountering John*. The Gospel in Historical, Literary, and Theological Perspective (Grand Rapids, MI 1999) 58.

<sup>25</sup> B. WITHERINGTON, *The Many Faces of the Christ*. The Christologies of the New Testament and Beyond (New York 1998) 171.

<sup>26</sup> WITHERINGTON, *The Many Faces*, 171.

<sup>27</sup> C. K. BARRETT, *The Gospel According to St. John*. An Introduction with Commentary on the Greek Text (Philadelphia, PA 1978) 156.

<sup>28</sup> A.J. KÖSTENBERGER, *John*. Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament (ECNT; Grand Rapids, MI 2004) 49.

would expect υἱός, since Jesus is repeatedly referred to as God's Son in the Fourth Gospel and elsewhere in the New Testament" <sup>29</sup>. But here he is named as "God" <sup>30</sup>.

The key term in the Greek phrase of John 1,18 is μονογενής. As mentioned earlier, interpreters disagree about its intended meaning: some follow the traditional translation "only begotten", while others object that this is not a good etymological reading of the Greek term <sup>31</sup>. The precise nuance of μονογενής remains a subject of debate. In the opinion of Harris, "[w]ith respect to 1,18, the divine origin of Jesus, though an important concept, is not where the stress lies in the prologue" <sup>32</sup>. These and other texts demonstrate that μονογενής is employed in the sense of "unique" without any hint of the notion of birth or derivation. Is the expression μονογενής θεός important to John?

## II. THE MEANING OF ΜΟΝΟΓΕΝΗΣ ΘΕΟΣ IN JOHN 1,18

The expression μονογενής θεός has great significance in the context of the Prologue. However one resolves the textual problem in John 1,18, the issue of the meaning of μονογενής remains, since all of the textual variants of the verse include this difficult expression <sup>33</sup>. As F. McHugh observes, "the evidence for the text of 1,18b is very finely balanced between μονογενής θεός (UBS and NA), and μονογενής υἱός. The editors of the UBS and NA prefer the former because it has earlier and better support among the Greek MSS of the Gospel, whereas ὁ μονογενής θεός, with the article, is much better attested among the early Fathers" <sup>34</sup>.

Schnackenburg and Barrett observe that the meaning is basically unaltered whether one reads ὁ μονογενής θεός or ὁ μονογενής υἱός, although both prefer the former on text-critical grounds (P<sup>66</sup> and P<sup>75</sup>) <sup>35</sup>. The textual evidence, however, may tell us more about the second century than about

<sup>29</sup> D.M. SMITH, *John* (ANTC; Nashville, TN 1999) 62.

<sup>30</sup> L. MORRIS, *The Gospel According to John*. Revised Edition (NICNT; Grand Rapids, MI 1995) 100.

<sup>31</sup> KEENER, *The Gospel of John*, 412. See also Morris, *John*, 105.

<sup>32</sup> HARRIS, *Prologue and Gospel*, 105.

<sup>33</sup> HARRIS, *Jesus as God*, 82.

<sup>34</sup> J.F. MCHUGH, *John 1-4* (ICC; London 2009) 69: "The latter, ὁ μονογενής υἱός, is the reading most widely attested among the totality of the MSS, the versions and the Fathers".

<sup>35</sup> R. SCHNACKENBURG, *The Gospel According to St. John*, 1.54. See also D.A. FENNEMA, "John 1.18: 'God, the Only Son'", *NTS* 31 (1985) 124-135.

what John and his original listeners would have assumed this term to mean. In fact, Jesus is the “only” (μονογενής) Son of the Father (see John 1,14.18; 3,16.18) <sup>36</sup>. God may have many “children” (τέκνα), but God has only one “Son”. The assertion that only the Son has seen the Father would be exceptional in the Hellenistic world, in which direct knowledge of the invisible God was considered to be impossible for human beings <sup>37</sup>. Greek and Roman sources emphasize God’s invisibility, while some writers suggest that only the pure intellect could apprehend or “see” the divine <sup>38</sup>.

Köstenberger also asserts that the manuscripts are split as to whether John really wrote “the one and only God” (μονογενής θεός) or “the “one and only Son” (μονογενής υἱός) <sup>39</sup>. The second reading appears to be better supported by both external and internal evidence <sup>40</sup>. To use a principle of textual criticism, the *lectio difficilior* is without doubt “God the one and only.” Nevertheless, the Johannine expression follows the more natural “Father and Son” relationship. It is not easy to understand what would cause anyone to make the change from “God” to “Son”. The title is used, however, in a manner characteristic of John, with the result that μονογενής is the attribute and υἱός the actual characterization.

In any case, the purpose of the term is to describe the unity of the Father and the Son, which is fundamental to the Johannine concept of revelation <sup>41</sup>. Which is more likely to be the true reading? This expression brings out the intimacy of the Father and the Son. What, then, does John mean? Certainly, John intends to affirm that God, in his essential being, has never yet been seen by people. It is widely acknowledged that the Gospel of John was written to an audience that was expected to understand the sapiential orientation of the work, as clearly signaled by the Prologue. On the other hand, no human being, John affirms, has ever had a straightforward vision of God <sup>42</sup>. How, then, does John see the connection between the Prologue and the rest of the Gospel?

<sup>36</sup> C.R. KOESTER, *The Word of Life. A Theology of John’s Gospel* (Grand Rapids, MI 2008) 48.

<sup>37</sup> R.E. BROWN, *The Gospel According to John I-XII. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 29; Garden City, NY 1985) 36

<sup>38</sup> The views of Greek authors on this issue are varied; see, Xenophon, *Mom.* 1.4.9; Epictetus, *Diatr.* 1.6.19; Plutarch, *Isis* 9; *Mor.* 354D.

<sup>39</sup> KÖSTENBERGER, *Encountering John*, 58.

<sup>40</sup> MORRIS, *The Gospel*, 100.

<sup>41</sup> KEENER, *The Gospel of John*, 424.

<sup>42</sup> J. PAINTER – R.A. CULPEPPER – F.F. SEGOVIA, eds. *Word, Theology, and Community in John* (St. Louis, MO 2002) 50.



## III. JOHN'S PROLOGUE, ΜΟΝΟΓΕΝΗΣ AND THE IDENTITY OF JESUS

In John's Gospel and the First Epistle of John, μονογενής appears five times. In John 3,16.18 and 1 John 4,9 it qualifies God's "Son". In John 1,18 it stands in apposition to God, while in John 1,14 it stands alone without an expressed substantive (δόξαν ὡς μονογενοῦς παρὰ πατρός). In fact, when μονογενής appears without an expressed substantive in the sense of "only child", there is no difficulty in adding the notion "son" in the latter two passages, especially since παρὰ πατρός follows immediately. Even while drawing different conclusions from the evidence, many scholars argue that in John 1,14, and in other Johannine texts, μονογενής ought to be understood in accordance with the common meaning of this adjective: "unique" or "only" <sup>43</sup>.

Furthermore, the explanation of μονογενής is determined by the uniqueness of Jesus, that is, by the uniqueness of his relation to the Father, of his mission, and of the revelation which it offers. This theme runs throughout the Gospel of John (see John 3,13; 6,46; 14,6). This notion is introduced in John 1,18: θεὸν οὐδεὶς ἑώρακεν πώποτε μονογενὴς θεὸς ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκεῖνος ἐξηγήσατο (cf. John 8,38.55; 14,9) <sup>44</sup>. It is to be noted that here the use of μονογενής highlights that God's only Son, Jesus, is the only source of revelation about the Father. Hence, in these passages in the Gospel of John and the First Epistle of John, μονογενής stresses the unique status of Jesus as the *only* Son of God <sup>45</sup>.

John's Prologue introduces the understanding of Jesus' identity to the readers. On the one hand, "John's striking opening sets up the question of Jesus' identity that will dominate the rest of the entire Gospel, ultimately leading to Jesus' crucifixion: the deity of Christ" <sup>46</sup>. On the other hand, "This early Jesus was the uniquely born Son of God (1,14.18); he was God's *logos* which had been with God from the beginning of the cosmos (1,1), but had then become flesh (σάρξ), as is famously stated at 1,14" <sup>47</sup>. The Johannine Jesus is both human and divine. Jesus grew up as the son of Joseph in Nazareth (John 1,45), a town noted for nothing

<sup>43</sup> Παρὰ πατρός could be taken with μονογενοῦς, either as a periphrasis or as a genitive expressing possession; it could also be taken with δόξα with the notion of "coming" supplied.

<sup>44</sup> BROWN, *John*, 17.

<sup>45</sup> PENDRIX, "ΜΟΝΟΓΕΝΗΣ", 595.

<sup>46</sup> KOSTENBERGER – MERKLE – PLUMMER, *Going Deeper*, 50.

<sup>47</sup> T. ENGBERG-PEDERSEN, "Logos and Pneuma in the Fourth Gospel", in *Greco-Roman Culture and the New Testament* (eds., D.E. AUNE – F.E. BRENK; Leiden 2012) 33.

good (John 1,46)<sup>48</sup>; but, at the same time, Jesus is also the *Logos* and the Son of God. Indeed, John asserts, at the beginning of the Gospel (1,1.18) and again at its close, that Jesus can be called θεός. What is being emphasized here? The real meaning of the idea of incarnation is that a personal being that already existed added human nature to that identity<sup>49</sup>. Evidently John's purpose, however, is to emphasize both the human and divine side of Jesus. The verse begins with the declaration that no one has seen God, an assumption that is based on Scripture.

Human beings do not see God<sup>50</sup>. It is interesting to observe that the use and significance of the verbs of "seeing" in John's Gospel have received little attention<sup>51</sup>. The verb ὁρᾶν appears 30 times in the Gospel, of which three occurrences refer to seeing God (John 1,18; 6,46), and in two cases to seeing the risen Lord (John 20,18.25). As mentioned above, Greek and Roman sources sometimes place emphasis on God's invisibility<sup>52</sup>. On the other hand, some ancient writers and philosophers suggest that only the pure intellect could apprehend or "see" the divine<sup>53</sup>. Moreover, Palestinian Jewish tradition emphasized the invisibility of God<sup>54</sup>, even if some visionaries claimed to have seen his glory in special mystical experiences. Some Jewish writers still acknowledged Scripture's teaching both that God spoke to Moses face to face<sup>55</sup>, and that Moses could not see all of God's glory.

Remarkably, however, there are only six occurrence of πώποτε in the NT, and all of them in conjunction with a word that has a negative connotation. That God, as he is in himself, cannot be seen by the physical or even the spiritual eye was self-evident in Judaism<sup>56</sup>. This interpretation highlights God's invisibility and incomprehensibility. What is the force of the double negative in v. 18, (πώποτε) "no one has seen God"? In fact, no human being has ever seen God — or ever will — since only a divine being can sustain such a vision<sup>57</sup>. In John 1,18, πώποτε has an

<sup>48</sup> D.M. SMITH, *The Theology of the Gospel of John* (New Testament Theology; Cambridge 1995) 22.

<sup>49</sup> WITHERINGTON, *The Many Faces*, 172.

<sup>50</sup> SMITH, *John*, 63.

<sup>51</sup> HARRIS, *Prologue and Gospel*, 98.

<sup>52</sup> KEENER, *The Gospel of John*, 423.

<sup>53</sup> MAXIMUS OF TYRE, *Or.* 11.9-10.

<sup>54</sup> 1QS 11.20; 2 En. 48:5; 'Abot R. Nat. 2.39 A; *Sipra VDDen.* par. 2.2.2-3; *Tg. Ps-J.* on Gen 16,13; *Tg. Neof.* on Exod 33,23; *Tg. Onq.* on Exod 33,20.23.

<sup>55</sup> *L.A.B.* 11.14; cf. *Sipra VDDen.* par. 2.2.3.3.

<sup>56</sup> HARRIS, *Jesus as God*, 93.

<sup>57</sup> SMITH, *John*, 62: "The verse begins with the assertion that no one has seen God, an assumption that is apparently based on Scripture".

emphatic position at the end of the clause, demonstrating a stylistic trait of the Gospel of John.

Hence, the categorical use of the double negative *πόποτε* in John may be doing more than confirming that prior to the coming of the *Logos*, Jesus Christ, no one in history had, in fact, seen God. On the other hand, the Prologue concludes with the affirmation that Jesus (God's only Son) has made God known. It is interesting to note that the Greek verb translated "to make known" (ἐξηγήομαι) means "to explain or interpret"<sup>58</sup>. For Jesus to "make God known" implies more than communicating a visual image; the Greek term suggests that Jesus fully interprets God.

On the one hand, the intimate relation between Father and Son is not only relational, but also implies their shared nature and similar role<sup>59</sup>. On the other hand, even though some critics still favor the reading "only son", the text more naturally reads "the only God, who is in the bosom of the Father"<sup>60</sup>. In view of the fact that *μονογενής* is usually equivalent to *unicus* ("sole" or "unique"), can it ever-mean *unigenitus* ("only begotten")?

Furthermore, a significant issue is the use of *εἰς* at the end of v.18. What is the import of the preposition? Does it denote direction and movement, or location, or a combination of motion and rest? In classical and Hellenistic Greek *εἰς* frequently denotes not simply orientation or direction but "movement toward or into" in either a literal or a metaphorical sense. It is interesting to observe that *εἰς* does not follow a verb of motion in v. 18. Some interpreters maintain that the preposition here "means that Jesus has access to the innermost being of God"<sup>61</sup>. Others develop this idea further. For instance, I. de la Potterie<sup>62</sup> interprets the whole phrase to mean: "turned toward the Father's bosom". For de la Potterie, John 1,18 represents a culminating point in Johannine thought: "the constant orientation of the Son toward the bosom of the Father as toward his origin (*εἰς* not *πρός*), as toward the source of his own life (*εἰς τὸν κόλπον*)"<sup>63</sup>.

The claim of de la Potterie that John maintains a careful distinction between *εἰς* and *ἐν* is not without difficulties. A small number of scholars argue that *εἰς τὸν κόλπον* means nothing more than the personal juxtaposition of Son and Father<sup>64</sup>. Some of the Greek Fathers give *εἰς* an

<sup>58</sup> M. SILVA, "Ἐξηγήομαι", in *New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology and Exegesis*, 5 Vols. (Grand Rapids, MI 2014) 2.212.

<sup>59</sup> KEENER, *The Gospel of John*, 425.

<sup>60</sup> HARRIS, *Jesus as God*, 88.

<sup>61</sup> HARRIS, *Jesus as God*, 97.

<sup>62</sup> I. DE LA POTTERIE, "L'emploi dynamique de *εἰς* dans Saint Jean et ses incidences theologiques", *Biblica* 43 (1962) 366-387.

<sup>63</sup> DE LA POTTERIE, "L'emploi", 386.

<sup>64</sup> HARRIS, *Jesus as God*, 98.

unchanging sense, and for this reason conclude that the verse explains the consubstantially of the Father and Son.

Chrysostom, for instance, says that the Son's dwelling in the Father's bosom involves an affinity of essence: "The Father would not have in his bosom one of another essence" <sup>65</sup>. According to Harris, "There have been and still are scholars who accept μονογενής θεός as the original reading, and certainly there is more likelihood of scribes changing μονογενής θεός to μονογενής υἱός than vice versa" <sup>66</sup>. In fact, the etymology of μονογενής shows a connection not with the notion of "begetting" (γεννᾶσθαι) <sup>67</sup>, but with that of "existence" (γίγνεσθαι). It is not surprising, however, that μονογενής soon came to have implications of "begetting" or "generation," since in 1 John 5,18 it is said that Christ was selected as ὁ γεννηθεὶς ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ.

Some interpreters argue that John 1,14 offers no comment on the individual preexistence of the Son <sup>68</sup>, but instead speaks only about an abstract idea or quality of God. In my view, this position is incorrect. Much of the discussion is over whether Jesus can be called θεός, which assumes knowledge of what is meant by God <sup>69</sup>. The view of John is that apart from Jesus God is not known, or that in the coming of Jesus knowledge of God is now given in a definitive way, and is available from no other source.

For this reason, it is most likely that John in fact refers to Jesus as "the One and Only God" <sup>70</sup>. If μονογενής is similar to (ὁ) μονογενής υἱός in John 1,18, then the corollary is that θεός stands in exegetical apposition to μονογενής as the only Son who is θεός. The anarthrous θεός is not indefinite. Since ἐκεῖνος in John 1,18 is specific, its antecedent μονογενής, as further defined by θεός, must be definite <sup>71</sup>.

This is a striking designation of Jesus within John's Prologue. Much of the debate about whether Jesus can be called θεός supposes knowledge of what is denoted by "God". As Harris observes, "inasmuch as the only Son is God by nature and intimately acquainted with the Father by experience, he is uniquely qualified to reveal the nature and character of God" <sup>72</sup>. John's notion, however, is that, apart from Jesus, God is not

<sup>65</sup> JOHN CHRYSOSTOM, *Homilies on the Gospel of St. John*, 15.2.

<sup>66</sup> HARRIS, *Prologue and Gospel*, 104-105.

<sup>67</sup> HARRIS, *Jesus as God*, 86.

<sup>68</sup> WITHERINGTON, *The Many Faces*, 171.

<sup>69</sup> SMITH, *John*, 62.

<sup>70</sup> KÖSTESBERGER, *Encountering John*, 58.

<sup>71</sup> HARRIS, *Jesus as God*, 92.

<sup>72</sup> HARRIS, *Jesus as God*, 102.

known, or that in the coming of Jesus knowledge of God is now given in a definitive way, and is available from no other source. If *μονογενής θεός* is taken as the correct reading in John 1,18, then the most adequate translation would seem to be “a unique one, who is God” <sup>73</sup>.

While this interpretation would seem to imply a stylistically awkward tautology, the result is not unthinkable in the context. Jesus, as the only Son by nature and intimately related with the Father by experience, is uniquely qualified to reveal the nature and character of God. This relationship provides the basis of God’s self-disclosure <sup>74</sup>, which, in turn, confirms the trustworthiness, indeed the excellence, of the divine revelation.

#### CONCLUSION

In a sense, John 1,18 evidently forms the climax of the Prologue. From the evidence presented above, the following conclusions can be reasonably drawn: 1) Applied to entities other than human beings, *μονογενής* means “only one of its kind”, “unique” or (extraordinarily) “of one kind.”; 2) As a title for offspring, the adjective ordinarily means “only” or “single”. Infrequently, however, the adjective may have been felt to carry the notion of birth or derivation because of a loose etymological connection with *γέννης*, *γένος* and *γένναν* or *γεν-* (the root of *γίγνεσθαι*).

In the larger context of the Gospel of John, verse 18 has a twofold function. It connects the Prologue and the rest of the Gospel by highlighting the theme of the Father as directly and completely known to the Son. In addition, if *μονογενής θεός* without the article is preferred as the reading, the most exact translation would be someone unique and divine; if the article is added, it could be read to mean “the one and only God” (*unicus deus*) <sup>75</sup>. That may perhaps be the best reading in view of the context.

302 Crescendo Way  
Silver Spring, MD 20901  
U.S.A.

Panayotis COUTSOUNPOS

<sup>73</sup> HARRIS, *Prologue and Gospel*, 108.

<sup>74</sup> HARRIS, *Jesus as God*, 103.

<sup>75</sup> MCHUGH, *John 1–4*, 70.

## SUMMARY

The expression μονογενὴς Θεός is considered one of the most difficult phrases in the study of the NT. Two decades ago, the prevailing view among New Testament scholars was that the phrase μονογενὴς Θεός in the Johannine writings means “only” or “single”. More recently, some scholars have argued the case for interpreting this phrase simply as “only begotten”. This article proposes that the overwhelming evidence from both classical Greek literature and the New Testament itself, including statements from outside the writings of John (e.g. Heb. 11,17), establish beyond question that this phrase refers to uniqueness and singularity, not to origin or derivation.

# RECENSIONES

## Vetus Testamentum

Hans AUSLOOS, *The Deuteronomist's History*. The Role of the Deuteronomist in Historical-Critical Research into Genesis-Numbers (Oudtestamentische Studiën 67). Leiden – Boston, Brill, 2015. xvii-429 p. 15,5 × 23

The majority of this fine volume is Ausloos' critical review concerning the history of scholarship on the relationship of Genesis-Numbers to Deuteronomy, the Deuteronomistic History, and the Deuteronomistic sections of the Book of Jeremiah, especially related to arguments about the redaction history of Genesis-Numbers. The last chapter includes Ausloos' methodological insights based on his review of the history of scholarship, including his proposal of a "criteriology that has the potential to allow us to determine whether (or not) an Old Testament text is akin to or dependent on the Deuteronom(ist)ic literature" (258).

The first chapter concerns the earliest discussions of Deuteronom(ist)ic influence on Genesis-Numbers in the scholarship of the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries. In this period Deuteronomy was recognized as having its own distinctive characteristics in contrast to Genesis-Numbers. Drawing from that consensus, Friedrich Bleek introduced the idea that the Pentateuch was the product of a Deuteronom(ist)ic redaction. However, John William Colenso was the most influential scholar in this period concerning the Deuteronom(ist)ic redaction of Genesis-Numbers. In fact, Colenso's work set the stage for future discussions, including the fact that the focus of the discussion on Deuteronom(ist)ic influence in Genesis-Numbers remains confined in large part to the very passages Colenso discussed. Furthermore, his emphasis on vocabulary as the most important criterion for determining Deuteronom(ist)ic influence continues in current discussions. Throughout the volume, Ausloos is critical of the lack of theoretical discussions on methodology, the imprecise definition of terms, and the circular argumentation often used in discussions of the Deuteronom(ist)ic influence in Genesis-Numbers, and this criticism is leveled at Colenso. Thus, in some ways, Ausloos laments that the methodological sophistication on this topic has not developed sufficiently from the 1860s.

The second chapter concerns discussion in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century. After lengthy charts cataloging the various arguments for Deuteronom(ist)ic elements in Genesis (66-73), Exodus (73-94), and Numbers (94-98) in this period, Ausloos devotes the next section of this chapter to "The Absence of Solid Argumentation on the Deuteronom(ist)ic Character of Passages in Genesis-Numbers" (98-100). During this period, many scholars simply noted Deuteronom(ist)ic influence without giving justification. When justification is given, it is generally on the basis of pointing to similar vocabulary between the passage and Deuteronomy, the Deuteronomistic



History, and/or the Deuteronom(ist)ic passages in Jeremiah, often in ways that appear arbitrary and contribute to circular reasoning. Ausloos finds it striking that, after the 1972 publication of Moshe Weinfeld's excellent analysis of characteristic Deuteronom(ist)ic phraseology (*Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School* [Oxford 1972] 320-365), scholars generally continue to uncritically identify vocabulary and phrases as Deuteronom(ist)ic (99). Ausloos then begins his analysis of Exod 23,20-33 by discussing representative interpretations of this passage as Deuteronom(ist)ic in this period. He concludes with the following methodological criticism: "it is almost impossible to designate a passage as Deuteronom(ist)ic when one cannot properly indicate what one understands to be the characteristic features of Deuteronom(ist)ic language, style and theology" (112).

The third and fourth chapters continue his critical review of scholarship from the 1970s onward, concerning arguments that these elements discussed as Deuteronom(ist)ic by previous scholars should be understood as "proto-Deuteronomistic" (Brekelmans, Lohfink) or "post-Deuteronom(ist)ic" (Van Seters, Rendtorff, Blum) respectively.

Chapter five is Ausloos' contribution for establishing more objective criteria as a way of responding to the failures of previous discussions. He insists on clarity between the following terms: "pre-Deuteronomistic", "proto-Deuteronomistic", "Deuteronomistic", "Deuteronomistic", and "post-Deuteronomistic" as well as ways of distinguishing "early-Deuteronomistic" from "late-Deuteronomistic". He introduces the term "simili-Deuteronomistic" to denote a later "imitation of the Deuteronom(ist)ic literature" (282) that nevertheless should not be connected to a Deuteronomist or Deuteronomistic author. He insists that any analysis of Deuteronom(ist)ic influence must first determine whether or not there is evidence of a literary relationship between the passage and the "Deuteronomistic Canon" — that is, Deuteronomy, the Deuteronomistic History, and the Deuteronomistic passages of Jeremiah — and that this determination must include an analysis of form, including "linguistic data, stylistic features and its compositional structure" (289), and content, including the widely recognized theological themes such as centralization of the cult. This analysis can determine "whether the text in question should be characterised as being of the *Deuteronom(ist)ic type* or not" (295) — that is, whether or not it fits within one of the terms proto-Deuteronomistic, Deuteronom(ist)ic, simili-Deuteronomistic, etc. If a text is determined to be Deuteronom(ist)ic in character, then the direction of influence can be explored, something that Ausloos recognizes as the most difficult of the tasks.

Ausloos illustrates his criteriology by asking if Exod 23,20-33 is a Deuteronom(ist)ic epilogue to the Book of Covenant and applying his criteria to the passage, drawing extensively from the history of interpretation. He concludes the following: (1) his careful linguistic analysis results in a negative answer, because the common vocabulary found between the text and Deuteronom(ist)ic literature is used differently; (2) the compositional patterns may have come from a widespread common tradition, thereby producing another negative answer or at least an inconclusive answer; and (3) his theological analysis suggests the possibility of a theological development within the Deuteronom(ist)ic tradition. He then provides (4) an excellent analysis of the versions of Exod 23,20-33, which leads him to postulate "an extended process of "Deuteronom(ist)ic" reworkings of the text,

without considering the latter to be “Deuteronom(ist)ic” *stricto sensu*” (334) — that is, the later additions in the versions can be labeled simili-Deuteronomistic. Thus, although the theological analysis may point to a possibility of Exod 23,20-33 being in some sense Deuteronom(ist)ic, the linguistic analysis, the compositional analysis, and his text-critical analysis point in the direction that Exod 23,20-33 should not be considered strictly Deuteronom(ist)ic. With this negative result, Ausloos does not continue to illustrate his method — that is, determining the direction of influence.

Ausloos brings some much needed additional methodological clarity to the question of Deuteronom(ist)ic elements in Genesis-Numbers. As someone who has been accused of contributing to “pan-Deuteronomism” (see R. F. Person, *The Deuteronomic School* [Studies in Biblical Literature 2; Atlanta 2002] 13-15), Ausloos’ discussion caused me to reflect critically upon my own methodology, while I was reading his critique of others work and his application of his method to Exod 23,20-33. Certainly, Deuteronom(ist)ic influence continues to be an important topic of discussion in Genesis-Numbers as well as in prophetic literature; therefore, I strongly suspect that other readers will also engage in a critical reassessment of the criteria we often use. This is the strength of Ausloos’ volume.

As Ausloos notes, most source and redaction critics reach their conclusions based on criteria that lack a high degree of objectivity, so that critics are primarily “depending on the hypothesis they support” (163), and that hypothesis seems to depend significantly upon the scholar’s own formative teachers. Although Ausloos brings some clarity to the discussion, ultimately we are left with few objective criteria, as he readily acknowledges, especially with regard to the direction of influence. Thus, whenever one identifies a passage in Genesis-Numbers with Deuteronom(ist)ic elements (and Ausloos seems skeptical about this possibility), the determination of the passage as “proto-Deuteronom(ist)ic”, “Deuteronomic”, “Deuteronomistic”, “post-Deuteronom(ist)ic, or “simili-Deuteronomistic” remains elusive, even if we agree with Ausloos that we can draw clear boundaries between these different terms (and I am skeptical about this).

Ausloos’ discussion of methodology should be read in the context of a growing discussion of the efficacy of source and redaction criticism as exemplified in other recent publications, such as D.M. Carr, *The Formation of the Hebrew Bible* (Oxford 2011); R. Müller – J. Pakkala – B. ter Harr Romeny, *Evidence of Editing* (RBS 75; Atlanta 2014); *Empirical Models Challenging Biblical Criticism* (eds. R.F. Person, Jr. – R. Rezetko) (Ancient Israel and Its Literature 25; Atlanta 2016), as the guild struggles to refine these methodologies that have served us well for so long, but now are the object of heightened self-criticism by those who understand themselves as source and redaction critics. Thus, although it is uncertain where we may arrive from such discussions, it remains clear that the kind of careful methodological reflection that Ausloos engages in is of great importance, if biblical scholarship can continue to be understood as critical.

Ohio Northern University  
Department of Philosophy and Religion  
525 S. Main St.  
Ada, Ohio 45810 (U.S.A.)

Raymond F. PERSON, Jr.

Sara KIPFER, *Der bedrohte David*. Eine exegetische und rezeptionsgeschichtliche Studie zu 1Sam 16 – 1Kön 2 (Studies of the Bible and Its Reception 3). Berlin – Boston, de Gruyter, 2015. xii-712 p. 16 × 23. €129.95

Die Einsicht, dass die Rezeptionsgeschichte biblischer Texte ein ebenso weites wie wichtiges Feld exegetischer Forschung darstellt, ist keine revolutionäre Forderung mehr, sondern seit mehreren Jahrzehnten im kollektiven Bewusstsein der forschenden Gemeinschaft fest verankert. Die entsprechenden Abschnitte der großen Kommentarreihen künden davon ebenso wie die Reihe der Blackwell Bible Commentaries und das Mammutwerk der Encyclopedia of the Bible and Its Reception (EBR). Flankierend zum letztgenannten Projekt hat der Verlag de Gruyter eine noch vergleichsweise junge Monographiereihe aufgelegt, deren dritter Einzelband mit der Arbeit von Sara Kipfer vorliegt. Ihm liegt die von Walter Dietrich in Bern betreute Dissertation der Verfasserin zu Grunde, die dort im Wintersemester 2013 eingereicht, von der Fakultät angenommen und 2014 mit dem Hanns-Lilje-Preis ausgezeichnet wurde.

So einsichtig die Bedeutung rezeptionsgeschichtlicher Forschung ist, so schwierig ist der Gegenstand in der Auswahl des zu untersuchenden Materials und der angewandten Methodik in den Griff zu bekommen. Mehr als in der klassischen Exegese, die auf einen überschaubaren Textbestand und einen bewährten Methodenkanon zurückgreifen kann, ist die rezeptionsgeschichtlich arbeitende Wissenschaftlerin zunächst genötigt, ihre Auswahl aus dem unübersehbaren Angebot von zwei Jahrtausenden produktiver Bibellektüre und die gewählte Herangehensweise zu begründen. Kipfer wählt sich für ihre Untersuchung das Erzählmotiv vom verfolgten und bedrohten David aus. Zunächst unterzieht sie den Gesamtbestand der Davidüberlieferung in den Samuelbüchern einem synchronen wie diachronen 'close reading', ehe sie sich anhand ausgewählter Beispiele aus Literatur, vor allem aber aus der bildenden Kunst, der Aufnahme dieses Motivs in der „frühen Neuzeit“, „in Europa zwischen 1575 und 1720“ (13) widmet. Das ist ein interessantes Zeitfenster, liegt es doch vor dem Zeitraum, mit dem rezeptionsgeschichtliche Abrisse in exegetischen Beiträgen in der Regel einzusetzen pflegen, und es ist eine interessante Herangehensweise, nimmt sie doch dezidiert die bildliche Aufnahme der schriftlichen Überlieferung in den Blick. Warum freilich die Wahl ausgerechnet auf das lange 17. Jahrhundert gefallen ist, bleibt unbegründet und wirkt ein wenig willkürlich. Nichtsdestoweniger ist die Entscheidung sehr sinnvoll und zu begrüßen, wird dadurch doch diese gerne im Schatten zwischen dem Reformationsjahrhundert und dem Zeitalter der Aufklärung stehende Epoche ein wenig stärker ins Licht der exegetischen Aufmerksamkeit gerückt.

Der Aufgabenstellung für die Untersuchung folgt ihr Aufbau. Man hat eine veritable Doppelmonographie vor sich, deren beide Teilbände sich auch ohne weiteres unabhängig voneinander lesen lassen. Band 1, der Hauptteil B „Der bedrohte David in den Samuelbüchern“ (39-307) unternimmt eine Exegese des gesamten Davidmaterials von 1Samuel 16 – 2Samuel 24 mit einem kurzen Ausblick auf die Chronik, in der das thematische Motiv eine untergeordnete Rolle spielt (300-301) und den Psalter (301-307), der durch sein System auf David bezogener Überschriften im Gegensatz zur Chronik einen enormen Wert auf diesen Aspekt der Überlieferung legt. Es stellt sich an dieser Stelle dem Leser die Frage, inwieweit

die frühneuzeitliche Davidrezeption durch die entsprechenden Psalmüberschriften gelenkt worden sein könnte. Es ist die für das 17. Jahrhundert anachronistische, aber doch interessante Frage, ob sich der „bedrohte David“ im damaligen Bildprogramm tatsächlich einer Samuelrezeption oder nicht eher einer durch den Psalter vermittelten Samuelrezeption verdanke. Dieser Frage, die im vorliegenden Werk keinen Raum findet, könnte die Verfasserin vielleicht im Rahmen einer kleineren Anschlussarbeit noch nachgehen. Der Hinweis auf Ps 6,1-4 im Kontext einer Darstellung von 2Samuel 24 im *Breviarium Romanum*, auf die Kipfer hinweist (523-524) gibt jedenfalls der geäußerten Vermutung Nahrung, ebenso wie ein Abgleich etwa der Sujets der im Anhang gesammelten Deckenfresken von Schloss Eggenberg (685-691) mit der schönen Auflistung der Psalmittel (303-305). Die Schnittmenge aus bildlichen Darstellungen von Szenen aus der Davidüberlieferung mit der Bezugnahme auf sie im Psalter ist hier hoch.

Die zweite Untermonographie widmet sich der Rezeption des Motivs vom bedrohten David in der frühen Neuzeit (311-560). Nach einem generellen Forschungsüberblick werden exemplarisch drei kontinentaleuropäische Werkgruppen in den näheren exegetischen Fokus gerückt. Das sind einmal das zunächst in den Spanischen Niederlanden, dann auch in Frankfurt erschienene, reich mit Bildtafeln versehene Werk „David, virtutis exercitissimae probatum Deo spectaculum“ des spanischen Gelehrten Benito Arias Montano in den Ausgaben von 1575 und 1597 (351-410). Zum zweiten handelt es sich um das Programm der Deckengemälde von Schloss Eggenburg bei Graz (411-488), deren Eindruck den Anstoß für die Beschäftigung der Autorin mit dem Thema gegeben haben mag (1). Schließlich kommt ein spezifisches Untersujet in mehreren Ausführungen in den Blick: David im Angesicht der Propheten Natan und Gad nach 2Samuel 12 (bzw. eben Psalmen 9 und 51) und 2Samuel 24, in der Betrachtung der niederländischen und flämischen Malerei (489-545).

Zusammengehalten wird das Doppelwerk von einer sehr dichten und hoch reflektierten Einleitung, die sich der Frage einer rezeptionsgeschichtlichen Methodik und der Interaktion von Text- und Bildexegese stellt (4-35) und einer knappen Zusammenfassung (561-567), die freilich nicht erneut alle Zwischenergebnisse rekapitulieren muss, die am Ende jedes Einzelabschnitts für sich resümiert werden. Ein Anhang, der neben Literaturverzeichnis, Autoren-, Stellen- und Begriffsregister auch einen farbigen Abbildungsteil umfasst, beschließen den umfangreichen Band.

Bereits dieser kurze Durchgang zeigt, welch enormes Vorhaben sich Kipfer mit einer derart dimensionierten Arbeit auferlegt hat. Ohne sich bei den Einzelteilen auf wesentliche Fragen zu beschränken und offene Grundsatz- und Diskussionsfragen einzuhegen, ist ein derartiges Werk nicht zu schreiben. Freilich legt die Verfasserin gleich zu Beginn der Arbeit ihrem exegetischen Teil ein enges Korsett an, wenn sie vorab die Entscheidung fällt: „Der vorliegenden Studie liegt das Entstehungsmodell von Walter Dietrich zu Grunde“ (11). Das ist insofern ehrlich, als es die prinzipielle Voreingenommenheit jeder interpretatorischen Arbeit mit dem Text transparent macht. Es ist aber auch ein wenig schade, weil diese Vorentscheidung die Auslegung der entsprechenden Passagen insgesamt stärker dominiert, als es einem frischen Blick auf die Texte gutgetan hätte. Redaktionsgeschichtliche Modelle ebenso wie rekonstruierte Davidbilder basieren ja nicht (nur) auf vorgefassten Thesen und aktuellen Moden, sondern haben ihren Ausgangspunkt bei konkreten Beobachtungen am Text, die dann bei kritischer Prüfung als

mehr oder weniger plausibel erscheinen. Kipfer stellt bei ihren Einzelexegesen durchaus interessante Beobachtungen auf der Ebene des sogenannten Endtextes an. An dem Punkt, an dem es für den primär literar- und redaktionskritischen Leser spannend wird, bricht sie aber nicht selten ab, und die Fragen, inwieweit die angestellten Beobachtungen Aufschluss über die Entstehungsgeschichte des jeweiligen Stücks geben könnten, bleibt oft offen. Bei kontrovers diskutierten Punkten wie der Frage nach dem Verhältnis von Lang- und Kurztext in 1Samuel 17–18 enthält sich Kipfer einer beurteilenden Positionierung. Die offene Frage betrifft hier freilich ihre Auslegung direkt — das fragliche Stück 1Sam 18,10-12 findet sich ausschließlich im Langtext, anders als die Parallele 1Sam 19,9-10. Nun mag es Gründe geben, beide Stücke mit Kipfer nicht wie Walter Dietrich einem alten „Erzählkranz vom Freibeuter David“ zuzuweisen — der „textkritisch umstrittene Teil in 1Sam 18,10-11.12b“ (63) taugt freilich als Argument für die Datierung von 1Sam 19,9-10 weder wenn man dem Lang-, noch wenn man dem Kurztext Priorität einräumt.

Insgesamt kommt Kipfer zu dem Ergebnis, dass das Motiv des bedrohten David bereits den ältesten, auf das 10. Jh. zurückgehenden Überlieferungen inhärent war, vom höfischen Erzähler weiter verfolgt wurde und anderen Texten, die „ebenfalls auf einzelnen Quellen und Erzählkränzen“ basieren (296), ebenfalls vertraut war. Gleichmaßen wird es in Bearbeitungen aufgegriffen, die von der Verfasserin ins 6. Jahrhundert oder die Perserzeit datiert werden. Eine Entwicklungsgeschichte lässt sich daraus nicht rekonstruieren. „Die Aufnahme des Motivs durch unterschiedliche Autoren und Redaktoren über diesen langen Zeitraum beweist jedoch seine Bedeutung“ (299).

Auch für den rezeptionsgeschichtlichen Teil hat die Autorin ein ungeheures Pensum an Primär- und Sekundärquellen zum Thema gelesen und rezipiert. Vor allem auf letztere, aber auch auf etliche Originaldrucke stützt sie sich, wenn sie zu Beginn das Weichbild der Davidrezeption im Bereich der Literatur ausbreitet. Vor diesem Hintergrund interpretiert sie exemplarisch das genannte Bildprogramm. Dabei geht Kipfer überaus sorgfältig vor und eröffnet damit dem Rezensenten viele neue Einblicke in eine ihm bislang weitgehend unerschlossene Welt. Zusammenfassend hebt sie noch einmal hervor, dass David im 17. Jahrhundert auch in der höfischen Welt eben nicht nur als siegender Held, sondern auch gerade in Leiden, Verfehlung und Verfolgung Gegenstand der Rezeption war. Zumindest ergibt sich dies aus dem zentraleuropäischen Blickwinkel, den Kipfer einnimmt. Womöglich könnte es noch interessant sein, dieses Resultat mit der französischen Perspektive (jenseits der Hugenotten), etwa am Hofe Ludwig XIV, oder der britischen Davidrezeption zur gleichen Zeit zu vergleichen.

Besonders wichtig und methodisch weiterführend erscheint mir an Sara Kipfers Arbeit die methodische Reflexion in der Einleitung. Hier stellt sich die Autorin im Anschluss vor allem an die Hermeneutik Gadamers und die Ikonologie in der Folge Warburgs der Problematik rezeptionsgeschichtlicher Forschung im Allgemeinen und der Bild-Text-Interrelation im Besonderen. In diesem Zusammenhang formuliert sie vier Thesen (18-19) zur Relevanz rezeptionsgeschichtlicher Forschung, die es verdienen, intensiver diskutiert zu werden. Wirkungsgeschichte soll demnach der Selbstreflexion der Exegetin und des Exegeten dienen, Aspekte des Bedeutungsraumes von Texten in unterschiedlichen historischen Kontexten und unterschiedlichen Medien erhellen und, so im Anschluss an Luz, „als Korrektiv“ fungieren (18). Besonders der letztgenannte Punkt hat es, nimmt man ihn hermeneutisch ernst, in sich. Freilich wäre noch näher zu bestimmen, welcher Art von

Textverständnis die Rezeptionsgeschichte korrigierend zur Seite zu treten habe, etwa einem direkten, unkritischen Zugriff oder einer historisch-kritischen Rekonstruktion seiner Entstehungsgeschichte. Im zweiten Fall würde damit postuliert werden, dass die gegenwärtige Deutung der Deutungen eines Textes in der europäischen frühen Neuzeit für sich beanspruchte, auf die gegenwärtige Deutung der Deutungen eines Textes im vorderen Orient des ersten vorchristlichen Jahrtausends als Korrektiv einzuwirken. Die Interpretation der frühneuzeitlichen Rezeption diene der Überprüfung aktueller historisch-kritischer Thesen. So verstanden ist die These wahrhaft spannend. Methodisch müsste sie im konkreten Fall eigentlich zur Folge haben, dass die exegetischen Ergebnisse des ersten Buchteils vor dem Hintergrund des zweiten Buchteils rückkoppelnd in einem dritten Teil erneut zu diskutieren wären.

Mit Blick auf das Verhältnis von Text und Bild verfiicht Kipfer vehement den Eigenwert des letzteren als zu interpretierendes Kunstwerk, das aus sich selbst spricht und nicht lediglich den Bibeltext illustriert. Angesichts dessen ist es schade, dass die Darstellungen im Bildteil des Anhangs sehr klein geraten sind und das Arrangement auf den jeweiligen Seiten nicht unbedingt als geglückt bezeichnet werden kann. Im Format einer größeren Briefmarke lässt sich nur mit Mühe die dargestellte Szene identifizieren, geschweige denn ein Detail erkennen. Hier wäre es besser gewesen, eine Auswahl zu treffen und diese dafür ganzseitig zu präsentieren.

Rezeptionsgeschichte ist ein ebenso weites wie wichtiges Feld der exegetischen Forschung. Auf der Suche nach den geeigneten Arten und Weisen, wie dieses Feld erkenntnisfördernd bestellt werden könne, bildet der Band Sara Kipfers einen beachtlichen Beitrag.

Theologische Fakultät Jena  
Fürstengraben 6  
D-07743 Jena

Hannes BEZZEL

Mark J. BODA, *The Book of Zechariah* (The New International Commentary on the Old Testament). Grand Rapids, MI – Cambridge, U.K., William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2015. xxiii-911 p. 16 × 24. \$58.00 – £26.99

This massive commentary has been years in the making. Boda prepared for it by writing a long series of articles on various aspects of Zechariah and by compiling an extensive research bibliography (*Haggai and Zechariah Research* [Tools for Biblical Study 5; Leiden 2003]). An earlier commentary, more pastoral in its aim and less ambitious in its scope (*Haggai, Zechariah* [NIV Application Commentary; Grand Rapids, MI 2004]), provided him with a full-dress rehearsal for the production of this one. The result is a work that is remarkably insightful, careful and thorough.

The initial sections give brief but comprehensive treatments of introductory matters, including text, historical background, compositional development, literary form and structure, inner-biblical allusions, and theological message, concluding with a select bibliography. Then Boda works his way through the text, dealing



in turn with each of the four sections that he considers major divisions: 1,1-6; 1,7 – 6,15; 7,1 – 8,23, and 9,1 – 14,21. An orientation is given for each of these sections, which is subsequently divided into a series of pericopes that are taken one-by-one. The format for the treatment of each pericope includes a general overview, translation with extensive annotations, and a verse-by-verse consideration of each major term, turn of phrase, and image. The translation notes fully compare MT with the ancient versions, particularly LXX, but emendations are relatively few and largely limited to instances in which an alternative reading has some basis in the manuscripts. The translation itself aims more at philological precision than phraseological elegance. The volume concludes with indices of subjects, modern authors, and passages cited from scripture and other ancient literature.

The richness of the exposition can be illustrated with regard to just one pericope chosen more or less at random, the vision of the four chariots (6,1-8). In the orientation Boda first positions this vision report in relation to the others that have preceded it. He notes that this vision resembles the first (1,7-17) in featuring horses arranged in teams by color and involved in some form of military activity described as “patrolling heaven and earth”. In the first vision, these horses have mounted riders who are on a reconnaissance mission, in contrast with 6,1-8 where the horses are pulling chariots and are sent to attack “the land of the north”. There is also a connection with another group of visions that have settings related in one way or another to the heavenly court scene as described in Job 1–2, including the vision of Joshua the high priest’s investiture (3,1-10) and the vision of the lampstand (4,1-14) in addition to 1,7-17 and 6,1-8. These visions are linked by the motif of heavenly beings being sent by YHWH to patrol the earth and the closely related motif of “the eye(s) of Yhwh”, both of which keep watch over all the earth, using the distinctive terminology of *hlk* (hithpael) and *šwṭ* to describe this divine scrutiny. The vision of the four chariots brings this thematic thread that runs through previous visions to its culmination in an expression of the ancient Near Eastern mythic pattern of divine warfare. All that has proceeded from the heavenly court impinges on the earth in YHWH’s punishment of Babylon.

This conclusion gives rise to a historical problem: Cyrus conquered Babylon in 539 BCE, and Zechariah prophesied later during the reign of Darius (522-486 BCE). Would “the land of the north” not have already been “punished” by the time Zechariah prophesied? Boda resolves this question by noting that Cyrus took control of Babylon without a struggle, and it was Darius who actually destroyed the city in the course of putting down a subsequent rebellion. The latter event is the historical context for a prophecy that describes YHWH’s sending out the heavenly chariot corps. In this case the connection drawn with particular historical events depends largely on Boda’s reading of the phrase *hēnîhû ’et rūhî* in the final clause of 6,8. The same verb form (*nûah* hipil) is used several times in Ezekiel (5,13; 16,42; 24,13) with *hēmâ* as its object to describe the unleashing of YHWH’s wrath on his enemies. Boda argues that the analogous expression in Zech 6,8 means the same thing, even though its object is *rûah* (“spirit”, “wind”) rather than *hēmâ* (“anger”) because *rûah* can occasionally connote anger.

This is surely a plausible suggestion, but one can readily imagine various other readings of the phrase based on other meanings that *rûah* normally has — in which case YHWH’s deployment of the chariots might be for some purpose other than the wrathful destruction of Babylon, and the vision might have a historical setting other than Darius’s defeat of that rebellious city. I raise this possibility not



to quibble about this particular point of interpretation but to illustrate how Boda does not shirk from the historical-critical task despite the by now widely recognized tenuousness of this enterprise. Other texts are also dated in much the same way. A particular turn of phrase and an inner-biblical allusion relate the passage in question to some other, more datable text, which in turn leads to a connection of the passage with specific historical events or specific persons. Given that Boda's proposed datings are grounded in a careful consideration of the text, they are always plausible, but this sort of dating is inevitably speculative.

As the exposition of 6,1-8 unfolds, the reader is presented with detailed discussions of mountains in ancient Near Eastern myth and iconography (6 p.), the military and ceremonial functions of chariots (4 p.), mythic descriptions of horses and the terminology for their coloring (3 p. complementing 5 p. in connection with the horses in the first vision [1,8-17]), and the cosmological role of the winds (3 p.), etc. There are also detailed discussions of loaded words and phrases, exhaustively surveying their usage in other parts of the Bible and noting possible inner-biblical allusions. Given such attention to detail, Boda's work is not a resource for someone looking for a quick-fix interpretation. This commentary is only for those who want to slowly savor each morsel of text.

Here is how Boda stands with regard to some of the standard questions in the interpretation of Zechariah. The oracles with which several of the vision reports in 1,7 – 6,15 conclude are not necessarily secondary additions. These visions were given over time, not in a single night (as might be implied in 1,8). The figure called "Sprout" in 3,8 and 6,12 is to be identified with Zerubbabel. The two "sons of oil" on either side of the lampstand (4,14) are royal and prophetic figures; neither is a priestly figure. The shepherd-flock oracles are not displaced (cf. *NEB*), but in their present arrangement they serve to hold together chs. 9–14. The "one whom they have pierced" (12,2) is YHWH himself (!). The passage in 13,3-6 is a critique of false prophecy rather than an announcement of prophecy's demise. No part of Zechariah is, strictly speaking, apocalyptic; the future in view is mostly proximate — hence no eschatological temple or messiah, etc.

The compositional history of Zechariah is described in broad terms without any detailed delineation of redactional layers. With regard to chs. 1–8 autobiographical material — vision reports, non-visionary experiences, oracles, sermons, and reports of sign acts — were given more or less their present form, adding 2,1-9; 5,1-11; and 8,1-13 in the process. This first part of the book took shape during the reign of Darius before the completion of the temple restoration. With regard to chs. 9–14 disparate oracles promising YHWH's intervention and restoration (9,1-17 and 10,3b-12), along with two other oracles promising YHWH's eschatological defeat of the nations and the transformation of Jerusalem (12,1 – 13,6 and 14,1-21), were combined with shepherd motif pieces (10,1-3a; 11,1-3; 11,4-16; 11,17; and 13,7-9) positioned at regular intervals. "These shepherd motif pieces are key to the editorial activity which brought together the originally disparate oracular units of chs. 9-10 and 12-14" (25). The core material in chs. 9–10 can be dated to 515-510 BCE, and the core material in chs. 9–14 came later, most likely during Nehemiah's governorship (445-433 BCE). Chapters 1–8, prior to the addition of 9–14, had become attached to Haggai. The final form of the book took shape in the mid to late fifth century, in the context of the gradual formation of the Twelve. Initially a Haggai-Zechariah-Malachi corpus was formed, which was subsequently introduced into the growing collection so as to develop the overarching theme of repentance.

For academic readers a positive feature of Boda's work is the richness of the bibliographic citations. At every turn, the footnotes show him to be in dialogue with other scholars. This often takes the form of simply citing the author, title, and page numbers of a secondary source, but sometimes his interaction with other opinions amounts to an excursus. Scholars will find here a point of entry into the discussion of many issues.

Given the current state of Zechariah studies, there is much here to disagree with, but because of Boda's thorough and careful argumentation, those who want to take issue with him may well need to reconsider the reasons for their position. The self-avowedly "evangelical" perspective of the New International Commentary series is evident only in Boda's respect for the text. There is nothing doctrinaire about his interpretation. This work will serve for many years as a resource and point of departure for all sorts of readers.

5505 B Stuart Circle  
Austin, Texas 78721 (U.S.A.)

Michael H. FLOYD

Mette BUNDVAD, *Time in the Book of Ecclesiastes* (Oxford Theology and Religion Monographs). Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2015.  
x-211 p. 14 × 22. £65.00

Quest'opera costituisce la pubblicazione della Tesi dottorale di Mette Bundvad, difesa a Oxford nel 2012 con il prof. John Barton; l'autrice è docente all'Università di Teologia di Copenhagen. Bundvad parte dall'assunto che il tema del tempo è centrale nel Qohelet, da lei chiamato "Ecclesiaste", secondo un uso ancora frequente.

Il primo capitolo (11-23) è dedicato alle questioni generali relative al Qohelet. Si presuppone l'unità di autore, pur mettendo in evidenza le contraddizioni esistenti nel libro, esaminate in base al criterio della "reader's response" (cf. 20).

Il capitolo 2 (23-43) è dedicato all'analisi del concetto di "tempo" nella Bibbia ebraica, specialmente sotto l'aspetto linguistico; Bundvad offre una panoramica degli studi più recenti. Si discute in particolare (38-43) la tesi della "relatività linguistica" di B.L. Whorf (*Language, Thought and Reality* [Cambridge, MA 1956]). Questo approccio mediante studi di carattere linguistico, ma anche antropologico, è una delle caratteristiche che rendono lo studio di Bundvad certamente innovativo; cf. più avanti l'attenzione alla retorica (176-178), alla luce dello studio di G. D. Salyer, *Vain Rhetoric. Private Insight and Public Debate in Ecclesiastes* (JSOTSup 327; Sheffield 2001).

Nel capitolo 3 (45-82) viene proposta una lettura esegetica di Qo 1,4-11 e 12,1-7. Nel poema che apre il libro, Qohelet pone una stretta connessione "between the search of human meaning and the structure of world time" (51), suggerendo così l'esistenza di una tensione irrisolta tra il tempo del mondo e il tempo vissuto dall'uomo (cf. 73). "Due to the way that time is set up, humanity is cut off from the past and the future" (58). In secondo luogo, "the reality of time limits and hinders human cognition" (59). L'analisi di Qo 12,1-7 rivela poi che la percezione che governa la nostra comprensione dell'ordine temporale è sempre limitata e potenzialmente errata (61; cf. anche oltre, 106); si tratta di un assunto che attraversa l'intera opera di Bundvad. In particolare, essa propone di leggere 12,1-7

assieme a 1,4-11 (60-64; 72-74), cosa che di rado viene fatta dai commentatori. Secondo Bundvad, la menzione di Dio in 12,6-7 è sarcastica, “a thinly veiled accusation” (70). Un doppio *excursus* completa il capitolo 3, uno su *hebel* (76-80), per Bundvad una metafora dai molti significati, e uno sulla metafora del sole, molto usata dal Qohelet (81-82).

Il capitolo 4 (83-114) discute la percezione del presente che caratterizzerebbe le sette esortazioni alla gioia (Qo 2,24-26; 3,13-14.22; 5,17-19; 8,15; 9,7-9; 11,7 – 12,8); si tratta del tempo vissuto qui e ora da ogni individuo; a p. 85, n. 5 si aggiunge il testo di Qo 7,14; cf. E.P. Lee (*The Vitality of Enjoyment in Qohelet's Theological Rhetoric* [BZAW 353; Berlin 2005]); Bundvad ignora tuttavia B. Pinçon, *L'énigme du bonheur* (VTSup 119; Leiden – Boston, MA 2008) che dedica una buona parte del suo studio (171-220) proprio all'analisi di Qo 7,14, da lui visto come ulteriore testo sulla gioia. La maggior parte del quarto capitolo è dedicata poi all'analisi di Qo 3,1-15. Il poema di Qo 3,1-8 non nega la libertà di azione degli esseri umani, ma rivela “their inability to understand how the temporal order influences and limits their existence” (99). Si tratta, per Qohelet, di una situazione voluta direttamente da Dio (104). Il testo di 3,14-15 confermerebbe che la situazione nella quale l'essere umano si trova è, per Qohelet, voluta da Dio stesso: “not only would seem that God is aligned with the oppressors in human society, he is also the original oppressor” (113; cf. anche 143).

Il capitolo 5 (115-154) esplora le connessioni tra presente, passato e futuro: “there is [...] a strong sense in Qohelet that the past and the future are eating away at the edges of the present” (117); cf. ad esempio Qo 7,10 (120-122). Si esaminano poi i testi di Qo 6,1-6; 6,7-12; 8,1-9; 9,1-12, aggiungendo una riflessione circa la rottura della teologia tradizionale basata sulla causalità retributiva (151-154). I testi qui esaminati mostrano come per il Qohelet la relazione che il tempo presente ha con il passato e con il futuro rende molto difficile la possibilità di una esistenza umana piena di un qualche significato.

Il capitolo 6 (155-185) si focalizza su tre testi che offrono narrazioni circa il passato: Qo 1,12 – 2,20; 4,13-16; 9,13-15. L'intenzione è mostrare come il Qohelet faccia un uso consapevole della forma narrativa per comunicare qualcosa circa il rapporto degli esseri umani con il tempo (164). La narrazione relativa a un re del passato, che non può essere Salomone, ma che allo stesso tempo *deve* essere Salomone (173), narrazione posta dal Qohelet subito dopo il poema iniziale (1,4-11), serve a mettere in luce che “humanity's story cannot be told, simply because any notion of a human continuity to match that of nature is an illusion” (175). Tutte e tre le storie analizzate in questo capitolo rivelano che ogni impresa umana è transitoria e che l'ordine temporale del mondo impedisce qualunque forma di ricordo, anche degli uomini più famosi, qualunque buona azione o atto di saggezza essi abbiano compiuto (184-185).

In una breve conclusione (187-189), Bundvad sottolinea come lo studio del tema del tempo aiuti a risolvere molte contraddizioni presenti nel libro del Qohelet; il tempo è altamente problematico, a causa della mancata corrispondenza tra il tempo così come si manifesta nel cosmo e l'esperienza che gli esseri umani ne hanno. L'incapacità di raggiungere sia il passato che il futuro rende gli esseri umani incapaci di comprendere anche il presente, che è l'unico tempo loro accessibile. Da qui il contrasto presente nel Qohelet tra la volontà di comprendere e investigare il senso della realtà e il fallimento di tale ricerca. In questo — nota Bundvad nell'ultima pagina del suo libro (188-189) — il Qohelet differisce dalle

concezioni del tempo presenti nella Bibbia ebraica e, in particolare, da quelle offerte dall'apocalittica. Bundvad sembra tuttavia ignorare studi già esistenti al riguardo: L. Rosso Ubigli, "Qohelet di fronte all'apocalittica", *Hen* 5 (1986) 209-233; L. Mazzinghi, "Qohelet and Enochism: a Critical Relationship", *Hen* 24/1-2 (2002) 157-167; V. D'Alario, "Qohelet e l'Apocalittica. Il significato del termine 'olâm in Qo 3,11", *Tempo ed eternità*. In dialogo con Ugo Vanni S.I. (ed. A. Casalegno) (Cinisello Balsamo [MI] 2002) 73-88.

Il libro di Bundvad viene certamente a colmare un vuoto circa un tema importante nel Qohelet, che tuttavia aveva ricevuto un certo interesse da parte di alcuni studiosi, in testi che Bundvad mostra di non conoscere: M. Perani, "La concezione ebraica del tempo: appunti per una storia del problema", *RivB* 26 (1978) 401-426; P. Sacchi, "Il problema del tempo in Qohelet", *ParSpV* 36 (1997) 73-83; M. Gilbert, "Il concetto di tempo ('ët) in Qohelet e Ben Sira", *Il libro del Qohelet*. Tradizione, redazione, teologia (edd. G. Bellia – A. Passaro) (Cammini nello Spirito. Biblica 44; Milano 2001) 69-89; cf. anche L. Mazzinghi, *Ho cercato e ho esplorato*. Studi sul Qohelet (Biblica; Bologna <sup>2</sup>2009) 210-214.

La visione del Qohelet che Bundvad ci offre, si inserisce nella corrente di chi legge il libro in modo negativo, un filone che conosce oggi una certa ripresa; si veda l'autorevole commentario di A. Schoors, *Ecclesiastes* (HCOT; Leuven 2013), altro testo che Bundvad non cita (l'autrice non ha certo potuto tenerne conto all'atto della difesa della tesi, nel 2012 — ma il suo volume è del 2015).

Bundvad ha certamente ragione nell'affermare che esiste uno scarto tra l'ordine temporale del mondo e il modo in cui gli esseri umani lo sperimentano e che ciò si riflette sulla vita degli esseri umani, rendendo il presente l'unico tempo a noi accessibile. Manca tuttavia una seria analisi della figura di Dio nel Qohelet, una figura troppo spesso liquidata da Bundvad con affermazioni categoriche (v. sopra); è significativo che nelle tre pagine conclusive non si ricordi neppure la figura di Dio. Si tratta di una carenza a mio parere significativa che impedisce a Bundvad di cogliere un aspetto teologico più profondo nelle osservazioni del Qohelet relative al tempo, le quali vanno oltre una pur presente dimensione antropologica e filosofica; cf. il mio "The Divine Violence in the Book of Qohelet", *Bib* 90 (2009) 545-558.

Alcuni ulteriori dettagli critici: il difficile 'ôlam (Qo 3,11), tradotto con "eternità", non viene di fatto discusso; cf. p. 99 n. 51 (e 102, n. 6, che è un po' una ripetizione; cf. 102-103). "Eternità" è traduzione possibile, ma in ogni caso da precisare; 'ôlam indica a mio parere "uno spazio di tempo dalla durata indefinita, che supera ogni possibilità di verifica da parte dell'uomo [...]" (Mazzinghi, *Ho cercato e ho esplorato*, 225; così Schoors, *Ecclesiastes*, 259-261, pur traducendo 'ôlam con "eternity").

Si può certamente discutere se il testo di Qo 1,12 – 2,20 costituisca una narrazione, come vuole Bundvad nel c. 6; a p. 165 si discute anche l'idea che questo testo costituisca una "finzione regale". Qo 1,12-18 costituisce in realtà una sezione ben delineata dedicata all'esposizione del metodo di ricerca del Qohelet: l'esperienza. Il c. 2 è piuttosto una metafora regale, una sorta di testamento; cf. R. Vignolo, "Maschera e sindrome regale: interpretazione ironico-psicoanalitica di Qo 1,12-2,26", *Teologia* 26 (2001) 12-64, studio che Bundvad non cita.

Infine, nell'analisi di Qo 12,1-7 (61-72) Bundvad non tiene in considerazione il fatto che 12,1-7 fa parte di una unità letteraria più vasta, e cioè 11,7 – 12,7(8). Il testo di 11,7-10 costituisce un invito alla gioia rivolto ai giovani all'interno della

brevità della vita umana, ma nel contesto di una chiara prospettiva religiosa, comunque la si voglia valutare (cf. 11,9c; 12,1a; 12,7). È significativo che dall'analisi di Qo 3,1-8 (90-99), seguita da quella di Qo 3,9-11 (99-106), Bundvad passi improvvisamente a Qo 3,14-15 (106-109), lasciando del tutto da parte i versetti sulla gioia, ovvero Qo 3,12-13, ove la gioia è definita "dono di Dio". Nelle pur negative riflessioni del Qohelet sul tempo esiste perciò una possibilità diversa: quella di cogliere, almeno nel tempo presente, la presenza di una gioia, pur se limitata, che Dio dona all'uomo.

Via della Chiesa, 123  
I-50030 Bivigliano – Vaglia FI

Luca MAZZINGHI

### Novum Testamentum

Richard B. HAYS, *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels*. Waco, TX, Baylor University Press, 2016. xix-504 p. 15,5 × 23,5. \$49.95

En 1989 R. Hays publia un livre ayant un titre analogue, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*, qui ne se contentait pas d'énumérer les passages scripturaires auxquels Paul fait allusion, mais affrontait une question méthodologique fondamentale, celle des critères à partir desquels on estime que Paul fait écho à tel ou tel passage des Écritures. Voilà pourquoi Hays commençait par énoncer un certain nombre de critères grâce auxquels il est possible d'éviter les erreurs. En voici la liste (29-32):

1. Paul et ses lecteurs d'alors ont-ils eu (ou pu avoir) accès au texte biblique auquel il pourrait être fait allusion?
2. L'accrochage verbal est-il aisément repérable, comme en 2Co 4,6, où l'allusion à Gn 1,3-5 s'impose?
3. La même allusion est-elle repérable en d'autres passages de la même lettre ou en d'autres lettres? Ainsi en est-il de Ha 2,4; Deutéronome 30-32 et Isaïe 50-54, dont on peut repérer les traces ici et là.
4. L'écho scripturaire mis en évidence est-il en cohérence thématique avec le type et le moment de l'argumentation paulinienne?
5. Les lecteurs du temps de Paul pouvaient-ils percevoir l'allusion (eu égard à leur culture, etc.)? Critère de plausibilité historique.
6. Combien de lecteurs (des premiers Pères de l'Église à aujourd'hui) ont-il avant moi détecté l'allusion scripturaire?
7. La présence d'une allusion fait-elle sens et éclaire-t-elle le passage de la lettre qu'on est en train de lire?

L'utilité de la liste ne saurait être niée, même si P. Foster, "Echoes without Resonance: Critiquing Certain Aspects of Recent Scholarly Trends in the Study of Jewish Scriptures in the New Testament", *JSNT* 38 (2015) 96-111, a récemment

montré qu'en suivant ces critères certains exégètes sont arrivés à des résultats contraires: aussi belles soient-elles, les règles ne suffisent pas, le flair et le jugement ont aussi leur importance. Il va de soi que les critères énoncés pour les allusions faites par Paul valent aussi pour celles faites par les évangélistes. Si leur liste n'est pas reproduite au début de cette deuxième monographie, le lecteur se rend assez vite compte qu'ils sont à l'œuvre tout au long du parcours proposé.

Si Hays passe en revue tous les types d'échos et distingue bien entre citations et allusions, entre prophéties et préfigurations, il s'attarde davantage sur la typologie à l'œuvre dans les récits évangéliques, autrement dit sur la relation existant entre les figures, celles de la tradition biblique préfigurant celles de Jésus et de l'Église. Hays dit toujours "l'Écriture", au singulier, pour signaler l'unité sémantique de la tradition biblique et son orientation vers le *telos* constitué par Jésus et l'Église.

Tous les chapitres sont divisés en cinq sections:

- §1 Matthieu, Marc, Luc et Jean interprètes de l'Écriture;
- §2 L'histoire d'Israël implicitement réécrite dans les récits de Matthieu, Marc, Luc et Jean; avec une insistance sur le jugement final en Marc, sur la fin de l'exil en Matthieu, sur la promesse de la libération d'Israël en Luc, et sur l'origine juive du salut en Jean;
- §3 La figure de Jésus; en Marc il est principalement le messie royal crucifié, en Matthieu l'Emmanuel, en Luc le rédempteur d'Israël; et en Jean le Temple de Dieu;
- §4 L'Église dans le récit de chaque évangéliste; Marc insiste sur ses souffrances, Matthieu sur sa mission, Luc sur son être-témoin, et Jean sur son unité;
- §5 L'herméneutique scripturaire de Matthieu, Marc, Luc et Jean.

Il est exclu de passer ici en revue tous les échos repérés avec pertinence par Hays. Je ne relèverai que certaines de ses observations, utiles pour comprendre la christologie du NT (car applicables dans leur grande majorité aux lettres pauliniennes).

Pour Marc (ch. 1, 15-103, l'évangéliste étant qualifié de "Herald of Mystery"), Hays souligne bien l'écriture paradoxale du récit, qui insiste obliquement sur la divinité de Jésus (61-76) et explicitement sur son humanité. Les passages qui dénotent une "divine christology" sont assez nombreux. En Mc 1,2-3, le *kýrios* est évidemment Jésus; mais Mc reprend Is 40,9-10, où le même mot désigne YHWH, et donne ainsi à entendre que Jésus est seigneur comme YHWH; en Mc 2,7 Jésus pardonne les péchés, apanage de Dieu en bien des passages bibliques (Ex 34,6-7; Ps 102/103; etc.); en Mc 4,35-41 (surtout v. 39), Jésus calme le vent et l'eau, comme YHWH (Ps 106/107,29); en Mc 6,34, Jésus est le pasteur d'Israël, comme Dieu en Ez 34,11-15; en Mc 6,45-52, il marche sur la mer, comme Dieu en Job 9,8 (ὁ τανύσας τὸν οὐρανὸν μόνος καὶ περιπατῶν ὡς ἐπ' ἐδάφους ἐπὶ θαλάσσης) — pour ce verset, il n'est pas sûr qu'on puisse exaucer les critères n.5 et 6 de Hays —; en Mc 7,32-37, Jésus fait parler les muets comme YHWH en Is 35,6 — dans la bible grecque, le terme *μογιῶλος* ne se trouve qu'en ces deux passages —; en Mc 11,12-14, Jésus maudit le figuier parce qu'il est stérile, tout comme YHWH en Jr 8,13 va laisser détruire la vigne et le figuier qui désignent l'Israël stérile. Cette manière de pratiquer une haute christologie en attribuant à Jésus des appellatifs ou des actions qui sont propres à YHWH dans les Écritures

mérite notre attention: grâce à elle les écrivains néotestamentaires n'avaient pas besoin de dire que Jésus était Dieu pour lui reconnaître une position égale. Ainsi en est-il en une bonne trentaine de passages des lettres pauliniennes. Qu'il suffise de mentionner un des plus connus, Ph 2,10-11 qui cite Is 45,23, où le cosmos entier qui devait adorer YHWH adorera désormais le Christ, unique Seigneur. Aux pages 24-25, Hays mentionne la déclaration de Jésus aux premiers disciples en Mc 1,17: "je ferai de vous des pêcheurs d'hommes", pour dire qu'il ne s'agit pas seulement de leur signifier indirectement qu'ils auront pour mission de mener leurs auditeurs à la foi en J.C., mais de faire écho à Jr 16,16-18, et peut-être Amos 4,1-2 où il est question de l'imminence du jugement d'Israël.

Le ch. 2 présente l'écriture figurative de Matthieu (105-190; il a pour titre "la Torah transfigurée") qui "encourages the reader to see Jesus as the fulfillment of Old Testament precursors, particularly Moses, David, and Isaiah's Servant figure" (109). Avec ces précurseurs c'est aussi toute l'histoire d'Israël qui est re-présentée (112), une histoire dont Jésus incorpore et personnifie la destinée (Mt 2,13-18 et 4,1-11; 113-120). À propos du traitement de la Torah en Matthieu, Hays montre que si le Jésus de cet évangile demande à ses disciples une justice supérieure incluant l'obéissance à la Torah (Mt 5,17-48; 120), le renoncement à la colère (Mt 5,21-26) et l'invitation au pardon (6,12.14-15) ne sont "pas des innovations anti-juives" (123), mais se trouvent déjà en Si 27,30 – 28,7, passage très important pour Hays: en bref, "Jesus's teaching about forgiveness is to be read not as a reversal or rejection of Torah but rather as a particular hermeneutical focusing on Torah" (124). Selon Hays, la déclaration de Jésus sur la coupe et le "sang de l'alliance" durant la dernière cène (Mt 26,26-29), est une allusion sûre à Za 9,11, car Matthieu a déjà cité Za 9,9 en 21,5. La parole sur la coupe permet également d'interpréter à différents niveaux la déclaration du peuple à Pilate: "Que son sang (retombe) sur nous et sur nos enfants" (Mt 27,24-25). "At the surface level of the narrative, they appear to be bluntly assuming bloodguilt on themselves. But at a deeper level, Matthew's narrative has already tapped into subterranean exegetical currents running the other way, currents that associate outpoured blood not with guilt but rather with cleansing, binding commitment, and liberation" (135). À la suite des commentateurs récents, en particulier de D.C. Allison, *The New Moses. A Matthean Typology* (Edinburgh 1993), il rappelle la place de la typologie mosaïque en Matthieu (143-145) et signale, entre autres points, que le ἐγὼ μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰμι de Mt 28,16-20 n'est pas sans rappeler les paroles de Moïse à Josué en Dt 31,23 LXX (καὶ αὐτὸς [le Seigneur] ἔσται μετὰ σοῦ) et de Dieu lui-même à Josué (καὶ ὥσπερ ἡμῖν μετὰ Μωϋσῆ οὕτως ἔσομαι καὶ μετὰ σοῦ καὶ οὐκ ἐγκαταλείψω σε οὐδὲ ὑπερόψομαί σε, Jos 1,5). Rappelant également qu'en Matthieu le verbe προσκυνέω a Jésus comme complément — Matthieu 11x; Marc 1x (mais dit par dérision en Mc 15,19); Luc 1x; Jean 1x — il ajoute: "Matthew highlights the worship of Jesus for one reason: he believes and proclaims that Jesus is the embodied presence of God and that to worship Jesus is to worship YHWH" (175). Résumant la relation de Matthieu à l'Écriture, Hays dit avec raison qu'elle ne se limite pas aux citations d'accomplissement. Il ne faut pas en effet oublier l'importance de Dt 6,5; Os 6,6 et des supplications du juste souffrant. Les échos scripturaires "préfigurent la réalité qui s'exprime avec une nouvelle clarté dans l'évangile de Matthieu" (187). Pour Matthieu, l'Écriture (1) est l'histoire d'Israël allant vers son achèvement et servant de matrice pour l'histoire de Jésus; (2) invite à la transformation du cœur, à une obéissance radicale et à la



miséricorde, (3) est une préfiguration du Christ, (4) annonce et appelle la mission auprès des nations païennes.

Le ch. 3 est consacré à Luc (191-280) et intitulé “La libération d’Israël”, car cette dernière est proclamée plusieurs fois dans l’évangile de l’enfance et reprise dans le reste du récit, avec en arrière-fond la thématique de l’exode de Jésus, dont Hays montre longuement qu’il est pour Luc le rédempteur d’Israël (221-264). Une place importance est évidemment donnée à la typologie davidique mais aussi et surtout prophétique, en particulier en relation aux figures d’Élie et d’Élisée. Quant au rapport de Luc à l’Écriture, on peut le résumer ainsi: “[T]he story of Jesus is joined seamlessly with the much longer narrative of God’s promises to Israel, so that it becomes a single story about God’s action to gather and redeem ‘a people prepared for the Lord’ (Luke 1,17)” (277).

En Jean (ch. 4, 281-345; intitulé “Le Temple de son corps”), où le nombre des citations et allusions à l’Écriture est bien moindre que dans les trois autres évangiles canoniques — seulement 27, alors qu’il y en a 124 en Matthieu, 109 en Luc et 70 en Marc (284) —, l’importance et la solidité de l’Écriture est néanmoins bien rappelée (Jn 5,39-40 et 45-47; 10,35; 19,28). Hays note aussi la façon dont Jean introduit différemment les citations en Jean 1-12 (“Comme dit l’Écriture”; 1,23; 2,17; 6,31.45; 7,38.42; 10,34; 12,14) et en Jean 13-19 (13,18; 14,24-25; 17,12; 19,23-24.28-29.36-37), confirmant ainsi la division binaire de son récit. Présentant Jn 1,17 (“Si la Loi fut donnée par Moïse, la grâce et la vérité sont venues par Jésus Christ”), Hays pose la question: la grâce et la vérité supplantent-elles la Loi ou la complètent-elles? Et y répond ainsi: “It is not accurate [...] to say that Jesus nullifies or replaces Israel’s Torah and Israel’s worship life. Rather, he *assumes* and *transforms* them” (287-288). Quant à la typologie en Jean, elle se fait en écho, du début à la fin du récit: ainsi, Jean-Baptiste dit de Jésus qu’il est l’agneau de Dieu (1,29), et Jésus en croix est bien l’agneau pascal (19,31-37); Jésus parle de son corps comme le Temple de Dieu qu’il relèverait en trois jours (2,19) et cela advient (Jean 20); il annonce qu’il sera comme le serpent de bronze guérissant qui portait son regard sur lui et il le devient sur la croix (3,14 et 19,37), etc.

En résumé, Hays montre bien que les récits évangéliques ne se contentent pas de citer ou faire allusion à l’Écriture, par leur manière de procéder et de décrire Jésus et ses disciples en utilisant les mots du passé, c’est toute l’histoire d’Israël qui devient Bonne Nouvelle. Loin de nous priver ou de nous détourner du passé biblique, les récits évangéliques invitent leurs lecteurs à y reconnaître le dessein salvifique de Dieu et le chemin de notre humanité vers son *telos*, car le *telos* et le chemin qui y mène sont inséparables.

Le travail de R. Hays est des plus stimulants et devrait intéresser beaucoup de lecteurs, pas seulement les spécialistes. Formulons seulement l’une ou l’autre observation. (1) Si les notes en fin de volume renvoient à des articles et monographies solides, la littérature secondaire en italien, espagnol et français est ignorée, alors que sur bien des points elle aurait aidé notre auteur. Mais les lecteurs américains étant sans aucun doute peu cultivés, R. Hays a décidé de ne pas mentionner ces essais. (2) Plusieurs passages où le jeu des figures est important ont été oubliés, comme la reprise systématique de 1Samuel 1-2 en Luc 1-2, cf. J.N. Aletti, *Le Jésus de Luc* (Jésus et Jésus-Christ 98; Paris 2010) 41-45; reprise d’autant plus significative qu’elle enclenche la typologie prophétique, avec un parallèle entre Samuel et Jésus, typologie prophétique décisive, car c’est grâce à elle que Luc peut résoudre la question de l’*anagnôrisis* — sur ce point, cf. encore J.N. Aletti,

*Jésus, une vie à raconter*. Essai sur le genre littéraire des évangiles de Matthieu, Marc et Luc (Le livre et le rouleau 50; Namur 2016) 107-127. Ces remarques critiques n'entendent aucunement remettre en cause la beauté du travail de R. Hays.

Pontificio Istituto Biblico  
Via della Pilotta, 25  
I-00187 Roma

Jean-Noël ALETTI

Richard LAST, *The Pauline Church and the Corinthian Ekklesiā*. Graeco-Roman Associations in Comparative Context (SNTSMS 164). Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2016. xxi-258 p. 14,5 × 23,5

Die frühchristlichen Gemeinden trafen sich in häuslichen Strukturen. Das Haushaltsmodell beeinflusse ihr soziales Leben, ihre Organisations- und Führungsstrukturen, sowie ihre ekklesiologischen Konzepte und ihre Mission. Diesem etablierten Bild in der neutestamentlichen Forschung setzt Richard Last (R. L. fortan) mit seinem Buch die Verortung der korinthischen *Ekklesia* in das griechisch-römische Vereinswesen entgegen. Er begründet die Wiederaufnahme der Diskussion, die Gemeinde als Vereinsform zu begreifen, mit neuen Einsichten über antike Vereinsstrukturen: Neueditiertes Material von zahlreichen Papyri und Inschriften über Griechisch-römische Vereine zeigten die hohe Varianzbreite des antiken Vereinswesens deutlicher als bisher (Einleitung, 19-20). Diese hohe Varianzbreite lasse es nicht mehr sinnvoll erscheinen, die etablierte Unterscheidung von sozialen Gruppen in Vereine, Synagogen, philosophische Kulte und Christusgruppen beizubehalten (Kapitel 1). Diese bisherigen Kategorien überschnitten sich zuweilen, so dass die Unterscheidungen für die Bestimmung der Christusgruppen öfter zu falschen Alternativen führten (24-25). Statt sie in solche Kategorien zu unterteilen, sei der Ansatz berechtigter, sie in ihren gemeinsamen praktischen Aktivitäten innerhalb der Varianzbreite im Vereinsbereich zusammenzuschauen. Denn es sei allen dieser sozialen Gruppen gemein gewesen, Speisen und Wein für ihre Mahlzeiten zu kaufen, Kronen und Inschriften für ihre Dienste zu organisieren und Neuzugänge zu rekrutierten, um ihr Einkommen zu generieren. In diese Struktur sei auch die korinthische Gemeinde als Christusgruppe einzuordnen (41-42).

R. L.'s Ansatz reiht sich in die zahlreich und divers unternommenen Vergleiche der frühchristlichen Gemeinden mit den antiken Vereinen ein. Zu berücksichtigen wären noch z.B. P. Lampe, „Social Welfare in the Greco-Roman World as a Background for Early Christian Practice“, *Acta Theologica, Suppl* 23 (2016) 1-28 und G. Theissen, „Urchristliche Gemeinden und antike Vereine, Widersprüche zwischen Selbstverständnis und Sozialstruktur als soziale Realität“, *Social Sciences Methods and the New Testament*. Festschrift J.H. Neyrey (ed. A.C. Hagedorn) (Sheffield 2007) 220-246, zumal sich R. L. öfter mit diesen Autoren auseinandersetzt. R. L.'s komparatistischer Ansatz unterscheidet sich von anderen Diskussionsbeiträgen darin, dass er keine Abgrenzungen der christlichen *Ekklesia* gegenüber den Vereinsstrukturen aufzeigt. Sein Interesse besteht gezielt darin, die strukturellen Übereinstimmungen der *Ekklesia* zur Vereinsstruktur zu erweitern. Das schärft seinen Blick in diese Richtung und generiert zahlreiche interessante neue Parallelen, die für zukünftige Untersuchungen der frühchristlichen

Sozialstrukturen zu berücksichtigen sein werden. Auf der anderen Seite lässt sein Ansatz den Blick auf alternative gesellschaftliche Sozialstrukturen für einen umfassenderen Vergleich vermissen. Seine griechisch-römische Gesellschaftsanalyse greift hier zu kurz. Ferner müsste das Selbstverständnis der Vereine und der frühen christlichen Gemeinden stärker berücksichtigt werden (im Ansatz thematisiert in der Einleitung, 5-15) und in den Vergleich miteinbezogen werden.

R. L. entwickelt über komparatistische Methoden mit Vereinsmaterialien ein neues, in sich stimmiges, detailreich und wohlstrukturiert argumentiertes Bild für die korinthische *Ekklesia*. Diese habe demnach aus etwa zehn Mitgliedern bestanden (Kapitel 2, 71-80), eine gemeinsame Kasse besessen (Kapitel 4, 137-148), aus der sie vor allem die wöchentlichen Gastmähler, wahrscheinlich in gemieteten Räumen abgehalten (Kapitel 2, 60-82), finanziert habe. Ämter wie die des Gastmahlvorsitzenden seien in wechselnden Zeitabschnitten gewählt (Kapitel 7, 190-197) und Ehrungen in Form von Kronen verteilt worden (Kapitel 5). Außerhalb dieser Struktur sieht R. L. keine Durchsetzungsmöglichkeit für die Christusgruppen innerhalb des von starker Konkurrenz geprägten Ehrsystems der römischen Gesellschaft.

Um die Kategorie des Vereins für die Christusgruppen überzeugend zu etablieren, problematisiert R. L. im Zusammenhang der bisherigen Unterscheidung von Synagogen und Vereinen eingehend den bisherigen Gebrauch des Synagogenbegriffs (Kapitel 1). Der Begriff der Synagoge sei entgegen gängigem Gebrauch nicht spezifisch für jüdische Kultzusammenschlüsse. Er werde auch außerhalb spezifisch jüdischer Zusammenhänge gebraucht (25, 30). Zudem seien nicht alle Versammlungen um den Jahwekult ausschließlich jüdisch, sondern auch multiethnisch zusammengesetzt (34-38). Schließlich sei der Begriff der Synagoge für den internen Gebrauch der jüdischen Selbstbezeichnungen ihrer Versammlungen nicht festgelegt. Diese würden auch mit anderen Begriffen bezeichnet (30-31). Anhand dieser Problematisierung und Präzisierung des bisher gängig verwendeten Synagogenbegriffs zeigt R. L. zurecht, dass die jüdischen Gruppen in andere griechisch-römische Vereinsformen einreihbar seien und somit der Vereinsbegriff mit seinen bisherigen Abgrenzungen überdacht werden müsse (41-42). Für den weiteren Verlauf seines komparatistischen Unternehmens lässt R. L. den Vergleich mit Jahwegruppen leider vermissen. Denn auch wenn diese sich strukturell nicht von anderen Vereinen unterschieden, formierten sich doch die Christusgruppen zum Teil aus den Jahwegruppen bis in Personenüberschneidungen hinein.

Um die häuslich-familiären Struktur der *Ekklesia* zu hinterfragen, setzt R. L. sich zunächst mit der Forschungsgeschichte der häuslichen Darstellungen der frühen Gemeinden auseinander (Kapitel 2). Er beobachtet in dem Haushaltsmodell ein apologetisches Motiv, das die moralische und religiöse Überlegenheit der frühchristlichen Gruppierungen über die Vereine darstellen wolle (45-54). Diese wichtige kritische Beobachtung mag punktuell für einige Darstellung zutreffen. Doch gilt dieser Vorwurf nicht all seinen Diskurspartnern des häuslichen Modells und sollte daher nicht so stark ins Gewicht fallen. Um die häusliche Struktur der korinthischen Gemeinde ferner zu hinterfragen, dekonstruiert R. L. die Vorstellung der einzelnen Hausgemeinden in Korinth, die sich zusätzlich zu der einen großen Versammlung trafen (56-60). So liest R. L. die *ὅλη ἐκκλησία* nicht mehr im Gegenüber zu einzelnen Hausgemeinden (57), sondern schlägt mit M. Gielen, „Zur Interpretation der paulinischen Formel *ἡ κατ' οἶκον ἐκκλησία*“, ZNW 77 (1986) 109-125 für Röm 16,23 vor, dass das *ὅλη* Gaius' großzügigen Akt der

Gastfreundschaft betone (59). Diese Lesart ist in sich nachvollziehbar argumentiert, widerspricht jedoch R. L.'s eigener Argumentation, Gaius nicht als Gastgeber, sondern als Gast zu verstehen (s. u.). Das merkt R. L. zwar selbst an, zieht jedoch keine Konsequenzen für die Argumentation daraus (59 mit Anm. 69). In 1 Kor 14,23-26 betone das ὅλη die uniforme gegen die pluriforme Gemeinde (59 mit Berufung auf Gielen). Gaius' Rolle spielt für R. L.'s Argumentation gegen die häusliche Struktur eine weitere Rolle. Bisher wurde er als ξένος (Röm 16,23) als Gastgeber gesehen, der als Patron die regelmäßigen Gastmähler wesentlich ermöglichte. R. L. plausibilisiert dagegen für ξένος die Übersetzung als Gast (65-71). Dieser Übersetzungsvorschlag ist gut von R. L. begründet und gründlich mit Parallelen belegt. Die Entbehnung eines namentlichen Patrons für die Gastmähler der korinthischen *Ekklesia* kommt R. L.'s Vorstellung entgegen. Er argumentiert, dass ein Patriarch die Gastmähler nicht über Jahre hinweg wöchentlich übernommen hätte (Kapitel 4, 118-126). Als Gegenmodell zu der Elitenfinanzierung der ansonsten sozialschwachen Mitglieder der korinthischen *Ekklesia* führt er finanzielle Modelle aus Vereinen an, die aus weniger bemittelten gesellschaftlichen Gruppen bestanden (Kapitel 3-4). So will R. L. zeigen, dass es auch für bescheidene Verhältnisse möglich war, eine Vereinsmitgliedschaft, bestehend aus ca. 10 Vereinsmitgliedern, zu unterhalten. Die Analogien bilden ein Sklavenverein aus Philadelphia in Ägypten, 2. Jh. v. Chr. und ein bescheidener kultischer Mahlverband aus Tebtynis, 114 v. Chr. Diese Argumentation erscheint sinnvoll im Diskurs der von R. L. angezeigten Modelle, da diese ihre Vergleiche mit Vereinen der *Iobakchen* und der *cultores Dianae et Antinoi in Lanuvium* durchführen, die sozialökonomisch vergleichsweise zu hoch angesiedelt sind und in Folge dessen die Vergleichsergebnisse zu Ungunsten einer Vereinsform der korinthischen *Ekklesia* ausfallen (Kapitel 3, 86-113).

R. L. zeigt faszinierende Daten für seine zwei sozial bescheidener angelegten Vereine auf und schlüsselt im Detail deren Rechnungen für die Mieträume und Essenslisten auf. Entsprechende Organisationsstrukturen hält er es für die korinthische *Ekklesia* wahrscheinlich (s.o.) und bündelt ihre möglichen zu finanzierenden Aktivitäten in einer konkreten Ausgabenliste (137). Evidenz für eine Gemeindegasse sieht R. L. in der zeitlichen und räumlichen Angabe von 1 Kor 16,2 (138). Über die Jerusalemer Kollekte hinaus habe es nach dieser Lesart eine weitere Kasse gegeben (137-148). R. L.'s zahlreichen und bis ins Detail aufgezeigten Parallelen und einzelne Alternativlesarten im Zuge seines Argumentationsdukts sind für sich jeweils erhellend und in sich plausibel aufgezeigt.

Jedoch bleiben einige Punkte problematisch. So bleibt fraglich, wieweit die von ihm gewählten zwei Vereine als Vergleichsobjekte hinsichtlich der zeitlichen und geographischen Einordnung zur korinthischen *Ekklesia* passen. Auch der Schichtvergleich von der *Ekklesia* zum Sklavenverein ist insofern nicht kongruent, als dass die *Ekklesia* eben nicht nur aus Sklaven oder aus niedrigen gesellschaftlichen Schichten — diese zwei Kategorien müssten im Übrigen von R. L. in diesem Kontext deutlicher unterschieden werden — stammen. Ferner wurden bereits mit den *collegia tenuiorum* Vergleiche von sozial bescheideneren Vereinen durchgeführt, die für R. L.'s Diskurs interessant wären, jedoch leider unerwähnt bleiben. Das antike Ehrsystem, das R. L. als dominanten Kontext für alle sozialen Gruppen des römischen Reiches beschreibt, und daraus schlussfolgert, dass die Christusgruppen nur nach diesen Maßgaben im Konkurrenzkampf überleben konnten, müsste differenzierter dargestellt werden. So wäre beispielsweise für die christlichen

Gemeinden alternativ zum Ehrsystem das Ideal des Altruismus im sozialen Kontext interessant, dass in der Antike auch auf paganer Seite bedacht wurde. Sich in Punkten von dem mehrheitlichen System abzuheben, und damit erlebte Defizite zu kompensieren, kann auch ein Erfolgsfaktor für eine Gruppe innerhalb eines Konkurrenzsystems sein. Ferner wäre im Kontext der Ehrungen mindestens von einem ethischen Anspruch und einem Selbstverständnis der christlichen Gemeinden zu sprechen, das sich den gesellschaftlichen Ehrungen und Konkurrenzsystemen nicht anpassen wollte. Schließlich werden etliche Wahrscheinlichkeiten, die R. L. aus den Parallelen für sein Bild von der organisatorischen Verfasstheit der korinthischen *Ekklesia* erhebt, in den Texten der Korintherbriefe nicht direkt angesprochen. Diesen Punkt räumt er selbst ein und begründet ihn mit der Alltagsroutine, die in den Briefen nicht von Interesse sei (14-15). Für die wenigen Texte, die R. L. als Indizien für eine Vereinsstruktur aufzutut, gilt, dass er sie für seine These plausibel macht und erfrischend neue Interpretationen bietet.

Interessant ist im Kontext der Gemeindeämter ferner R. L.'s Lesart der Abendmahlsstreitigkeiten in 1 Korinther 11 (Kapitel 7). Er führt sie auf das Versagen der Gastmahlsvorsitzenden zurück. Nach R. L. schlägt Paulus für die Lösung des Problems Neuwahlen vor (195-201). Damit liefert R. L. einen neuen Deutungsansatz dieser vieldiskutierten Perikope. Er passt gut in sein gesamtes korinthisches Setting. Die Übersetzungsvorschläge sind gründlich argumentiert.

Im Horizont der Christenverfolgungen stellt sich nach R. L.'s Vereinsmodell für die frühchristlichen Gemeinden die Frage, ob Christen, in Vereinsform konstituiert, nicht leichter erfasst worden wären. Texte wie Plinius, *Ep.* X.33-34; 93; 96-97 (R. L. nimmt *Ep.* X.96 kurz in den Blick, 19), die einen Argwohn der Römer gegenüber den *collegia* und *thiasoi* zum Ausdruck bringen, wären interessant, um diese Fragestellung zu diskutieren.

Ruprecht-Karls-Universität Heidelberg  
Theologisches Seminar  
Wiss. Ang. Neues Testament  
Kisselgasse 1  
D-69117 Heidelberg

Heidrun E. MADER

Jean MASSONNET, *L'épître aux Hébreux* (Commentaire Biblique: Nouveau Testament 15). Paris, Cerf, 2016. 493 pp. 15,5 × 23. €39,00

È significativo e anche un po' insolito che l'A. (1940-), primo direttore del "Centre chrétien pour l'étude du judaïsme" dell'Università Cattolica di Lione (1990-2005) e da anni interessato allo studio dei rapporti tra il cristianesimo e il giudaismo, abbia dedicato un volume così ampio al commento della cosiddetta Lettera agli Ebrei (= Eb). È noto che, tra tutte le opere del NT, essa è la più ostica per istituire un dialogo ebraico-cristiano, specialmente a riguardo del culto. Eppure, come l'A. dichiara nella Premessa, a suscitare il suo interesse per lo studio di questo scritto, così risoluto nel mettere allo scoperto l'inefficacia salvifica dei sacrifici anticotestamentari, è stata la constatazione che "i punti di contatto tra *Ebrei* e il Kippur sono più numerosi di quanto possa essere percepito alla luce di una prima lettura" (7).

Animato da questo interesse, il commentario è preceduto da un'approfondita introduzione (21-51), che delinea in modo sintetico la cornice storica e letteraria di Eb: l'autore ignoto, la canonicità, i destinatari pure anonimi, la data di redazione incerta, il genere letterario, la struttura letteraria concentrica, il movimento concettuale, nonché il *milieu*, il messaggio e il testo. Inquadrando così il "discorso di esortazione" (Eb 13,22), l'A. ammette di attenersi (36-41) alla struttura letteraria proposta e dettagliatamente argomentata dall'esegeta gesuita Albert Vanhoye (*La structure littéraire de l'Épître aux Hébreux* [Paris 1976]). All'interno di questa cornice letteraria, l'A. fa un commento ordinato, esegeticamente fondato, ben documentato e, in alcuni punti dedicati alla letteratura giudaica, anche erudito. Di ogni pericope di Eb presenta: una traduzione aderente all'originale greco; annotazioni di *critica textus*; un elenco bibliografico sintetico ma specifico; il commento per versetti e alcune note filologiche e letterarie.

La scelta editoriale di non ricorrere alle note a piè di pagina e, quindi, d'inserire tra parentesi nel testo i versetti scritturistici di riferimento, i vocaboli greci analizzati e persino le citazioni dei contributi studiati, appesantisce la lettura. Per di più, gli scritti giudaici e patristici sono menzionati con abbreviazioni non immediatamente perspicue per chi non è specialista in materia. La bibliografia generale è essenziale (11-19), pur comprendendo commentari e studi in diverse lingue. Immediatamente prima della lista degli undici *excursus* (489) e della tavola delle materie (491-493), il volume presenta tre indici dettagliati — quello degli autori moderni (435-442), quello delle citazioni bibliche e della letteratura antica (443-474) e quello dei temi (475-488) —, molto utili per una sua consultazione mirata.

Sotto il profilo contenutistico, è degna di rilievo la presa di posizione dell'A. a favore della cosiddetta "fede di Gesù", espressione che, come tale (*pístis Christou*), non ricorre mai in Ebrei. Interpretando i due titoli cristologici molto originali di Eb 12,2, "il pioniere e il perfezionatore della fede" (*tòn tēs pístēōs archēgòn kai teleiōtēn*), l'A. sostiene che "Gesù ha condiviso 'sangue e carne' con l'umanità (2,14), è stato reso 'simile ai fratelli in ogni cosa' (2,17) 'eccetto il peccato' (4,15). Ora, per Ebrei, l'impresa essenziale che ci è richiesta, legata al nostro essere di 'sangue e carne', è quella della fede, condizione della perseveranza. Se Gesù è soltanto un modello di perseveranza, non porta a compimento per se stesso ciò che per noi è la cosa più importante". Concludendo l'esposizione con l'appello all'alto numero di esegeti d'accordo con lui — motivo, questo, di per sé non così necessitante —, l'A. dichiara: "È per questo che pensiamo, con numerosi autori [...], che bisogna ammettere una fede di Gesù" (357).

A questo proposito, l'A. ha ragione a ritenere che, per Ebrei, Gesù non sia solo un "modello di perseveranza" per i cristiani. In effetti, Ebrei mostra come il Figlio di Dio, che ha condiviso "la carne e il sangue" degli uomini (2,14), sia diventato, attraverso la passione, morte e risurrezione, il "pioniere" (*archēgós*) della salvezza di chi crede in lui. Più precisamente: Gesù, "per primo" (*arch-*, da *archē*, "inizio"), "ha inaugurato" la "strada" (10,20), per entrare nel santuario celeste (cf. 9,12; 10,19) della comunione con Dio. Allo stesso tempo, su quella via Cristo è stato abilitato dal Padre (cf. 5,10) a "condurre" (*-ēgós*, da *hēgeîsthai*) i cristiani. Così Gesù è riuscito a "perfezionare" (*teleiōtēs*) la loro "fede" (12,2; cf. 10,14); termine, quest'ultimo, che qui, coerentemente con il resto di Eb, quasi di sicuro non è attribuito a Cristo, ma agli altri uomini. Difatti, a questo punto, l'agiografo proclama Cristo come il "perfezionatore" della loro fede, proprio perché in precedenza ha già spiegato come egli sia diventato "il pioniere della loro (*autôn*)



salvezza" (2,10) e "l'apostolo e il sommo sacerdote della" *loro* (*hēmōn*, "nostra") "confessione" di fede (3,1). Come ha fatto Cristo a "perfezionare" la fede degli uomini? Mediante la sua *teleiōsis* (2,10; 5,9; 7,28), cioè mediante il suo "sacrificio di consacrazione sacerdotale" (primo significato di *teleiōsis*), che per lui è coinciso con il "perfezionamento" (secondo significato di *teleiōsis*) della sua umanità, avvenuto nella sua morte e risurrezione. Dunque, è vero che, come scrive Massonnet, Cristo ha "portato a compimento" anche "per se stesso ciò che per noi è la cosa più importante". Ma è altrettanto vero che l'ha fatto non come *credente*, come gli altri uomini, bensì come "*mediatore*" (8,6; 9,15; 12,24) per loro dell'alleanza nuova (8,8.13; 9,15; 12,24) ed eterna (13,20) con Dio. Difatti, essendo stato consacrato dal Padre sommo sacerdote (5,10) ed essendo entrato "per primo" (12,2; cf. 6,20) nella comunione trascendente con lui (cf. 1,3; 8,1; 9,24; 10,12; 12,2), Gesù ha portato a buon "fine" (cf. 3,14; 6,11) la fede dei cristiani e così "ha perfezionato" pure loro (10,14; cf. 12,23), rendendoli partecipi del suo stesso "perfezionamento". Tutto sommato, la cristologia di Eb e, in particolare, l'esortazione alla perseveranza di Eb 12,1-13 resistono a essere usate come supporto scritturistico della tesi teologico-sistematica della "fede di Gesù". Questo non toglie che la tesi, nella misura in cui fosse in grado di salvaguardare la singolarità della relazione filiale di Cristo rispetto al Padre, possa presentare una sua coerenza sul piano della cristologia contemporanea e risulti utile nell'attuale predicazione ecclesiale.

Un altro punto discutibile del commentario riguarda "la tenda più grande e più perfetta" di Eb 9,11. In effetti, ci sembra che non sia così limpida l'interpretazione offerta dall'A., il quale peraltro dedica un *excursus* al tema del "Tempio in alto" e di quello "in basso" (206-207). Da un lato, egli accenna a varie interpretazioni di Eb 9,11, criticando in particolare quella cristologica: per sostenerla, occorrerebbe "andare a cercare appoggi che certo non mancano, ma che non si trovano nella lettera". Dall'altro, l'A. conclude: "Come il Tempio terreno permette al sommo sacerdote di avvicinarsi simbolicamente al luogo della presenza divina, così 'la tenda più grande e più perfetta' offre a Cristo l'accesso alla stessa realtà, sia che questa tenda sia attraversata per condurre allo scopo (senso locale del primo *dia*), sia che essa sia il mezzo per entrare a questa presenza" (239). In questo modo, però, Massonnet non chiarisce cosa intende l'agiografo, quando introduce, proprio nel centro strutturale e teologico del suo "discorso di esortazione" e in indissolubile parallelismo con il sangue di Cristo (9,12), la metafora della "tenda più grande e più perfetta". Certo, ha ragione Massonnet a sostenere che questa tenda "offre a Cristo l'accesso alla realtà stessa", ossia l'ingresso alla "presenza divina" (239). Tuttavia, egli non tiene in debito conto la distinzione immediatamente precedente (9,1-10) tra le due parti interne dell'unica tenda: la "prima tenda" (9,2.6; cf. v. 8) e la "seconda" tenda (8,7; cf. v. 3), chiamate rispettivamente il "santo" (9,2) e il "santo dei santi" (o "santuario", 9,3.7). Ebbene, se la seconda parte della tenda rappresenta metaforicamente la trascendente "presenza divina", che cosa rappresenta la "tenda" di Eb 9,11, cioè la prima parte della tenda? A questo interrogativo Massonnet non sembra rispondere in modo esaustivo. Di certo, la metafora della "tenda" di Eb 9,11 s'illumina se collocata nell'orizzonte della catechesi ecclesiale delle origini sul nuovo tempio del corpo risorto di Cristo (cf. Mt 26,61; 27,40; Mc 14,58; 15,29; Gv 2,19-22), che l'agiografo e i suoi ascoltatori molto probabilmente conoscevano (cf. Eb 2,3; 4,2; 5,12). Tuttavia, già Eb presenta indizi letterari a sufficienza per portare a interpretare



Eb 9,11-12 in questo senso: Cristo, attraverso la glorificazione del suo corpo, cioè attraverso la (prima parte) della tenda, è entrato per primo nella comunione celeste con Dio. Conseguentemente, chiunque entra in comunione con lui risorto, “perfektionato” nella sua umanità (cf. 2,10; 5,9; 7,28; 12,2 con 9,11: “più perfetta”, *teleiôtéras*) mediante il versamento sacrificale del suo sangue (9,12), accede alla comunione trascendente con Dio. “Tutti” quelli che per fede attraversano la prima parte della tenda — che, per questo, è immensamente “più grande” dell’antica (9,11) —, cioè fanno un tutt’uno con l’umanità glorificata di Gesù, entrano nel “santo dei santi” celeste, ossia nella gloria di Dio (cf. 2,10). In sintesi: la tenda di Eb 9,11 è il corpo risorto di Cristo crocifisso (cf. 13,20 e anche 9,10), “strada nuova e vivente” “per l’ingresso del santuario” celeste (10,19-20).

Opera della maturità dell’A., professore emerito della Facoltà di Teologia dell’Università Cattolica di Lione, il presente volume raccoglie i frutti di anni di ricerca esegetica, nonché di insegnamento in particolare dell’ebraico biblico e del giudaismo, prima nel Seminario interdiocesano Saint-Irénée di Lione (1977-1996) e poi nella suddetta Facoltà Teologica (1990-2005). Perciò esso offre un’organica presentazione degli studi su Ebrei soprattutto degli ultimi venticinque anni. Alla luce del carattere scientifico del volume, stupisce la decisione editoriale di riportare i termini originali sia con l’alfabeto greco sia in trascrizione (talvolta accentandoli, talaltra no!). Ciò nonostante, il linguaggio esegetico nitido e privo di tecnicismi, lo stile lineare e senza cedimenti divulgativi, ma specialmente una salda esegesi, che fa tesoro dei contributi di biblisti di fama internazionale, come Attridge, Ellingworth, Koester, Vanhoye e altri, portano a consigliare il libro a biblisti e a teologi.

Seminario Arciv. di Milano  
Via Pio XI, 32  
I-21040 Venegono Inf. (VA)

Franco MANZI

## Varia

Jason K. DRIESBACH, *4QSamuel<sup>a</sup> and the Text of Samuel* (Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 171). Leiden, Brill 2016. xii-353 p. 16 × 24. €148,00

We are now some sixty-five years since the discovery of 4QSamuel<sup>a</sup>. The rows that marred the early research (see G. Vermes, “A Regrettable Public Squabble over the Scrolls”, *JJS* 44 [1993] 116-117) are now long passed, and open access to the scrolls along with computer-assisted research have furthered our understanding of these discoveries. At the same time, new developments in textual criticism no longer consider the biblical versions as mere quarries for readings that could be more “original” than the MT. Rather, the versions are literary documents that are to be read in their own right before individual readings are isolated for their text-critical value. Today these developments allow for a more sober assessment of the

impact that the scrolls have on our understanding of the development of the biblical text. It is within this discussion that this fine study on the text of 4QSam<sup>a</sup> finds its place. Driesbach focuses on the “identity” of 4QSam<sup>a</sup>, namely, “the degree to which it is a copy or a commentary or a distinct stage of literary development of the text of Samuel, and [...] the degree to which it contains updated elements, or expanded elements, or sectarian elements” (47). He hopes that his approach will allow for a better assessment of the textual affiliation of 4QSam<sup>a</sup> with the MT, the Codex Vaticanus, and the Lucianic witnesses, with the result that 4QSam<sup>a</sup> may find its proper place in the text-critical study of the books of Samuel.

The book opens with an insightful example that illustrates the importance of this study: the insertion of some 70 English words into the *NRSV* in 1 Sam 10,27. This lengthy addition is not included in the *REB*, *RNAB* or the *NJB*, and its only complete witness is 4QSam<sup>a</sup>. Driesbach reviews the debate over this plus. Some scholars consider it the original reading; for others it is an explanatory expansion or a haggadic addition. Still others consider the question of its origin beyond resolution. Later, when Driesbach returns to this reading, he classifies it as an example of “content exegesis” and labels it a “scribal embellishment”. In his conclusion, he argues that this plus was added during the Second Temple period because it “reflects the persistence of the adversarial role of Ammon, at least literarily, in both the military and ideological realms” (299). His argument is convincing and I suspect that this plus will be removed in the next revision of the *NRSV*.

Central to Driesbach’s approach is the distinction between primary (more original) and secondary readings. The latter can reveal textual filiation among the witnesses. To illustrate the distinction between primary and secondary readings, he takes up the well-known example of Gen 2,2: Did God finish creation on the sixth or seventh day? The MT, the Targum and the Vulgate read “seventh”, the primary reading. The LXX, the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Peshitta read “sixth” and, because it is a secondary reading, Driesbach argues that there was “some shared contact with a text that departed from the original reading” (50). I would add that this agreement may not necessarily reflect textual contact but could give witness to a wide-spread tradition of interpretation that now appears in the LXX, the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Peshitta.

Classifying the secondary readings is a challenge, and I found Driesbach’s categories — textual error, linguistic exegesis, harmonizations, clarifying exegesis, and content exegesis — heuristically helpful. At the end of each chapter he reviews the agreements and unique readings in order to assess the textual filiation of 4QSam<sup>a</sup>. Driesbach notes several times the subjective nature of his analysis. While this is often true in textual criticism, it is seldom so plainly admitted. But the risk of subjectivity is offset by Driesbach’s dispassionate presentation of the data. One may disagree with his final interpretation of a reading, but all the data is presented without prejudice. He often wonders about the intentionality of the 4QSam<sup>a</sup> scribe whose exegetical changes are reflected in the transmission of the text. Were these changes intentional or unconscious? I do not believe we can know what the translators and copyists were thinking, and the question is not significant to the goals of this research. The fact is that scholars can perceive a different meaning in some 4QSam<sup>a</sup> readings with respect to the traditions preserved in the MT, regardless of the scribes’ intentions. The same is true for harmonizations. Whether they are conscious or unconscious is not important considering Driesbach’s convincing evidence that harmonization can explain several 4QSam<sup>a</sup> readings.

The chapter on linguistic exegesis presents minor changes in 4QSam<sup>a</sup> with regard to verbs, prepositions, the article and the direct object marker, nouns and conjunctions. These changes illustrate the readiness of the scribe to adjust discordant syntax preserved in the MT, and they demonstrate that 4QSam<sup>a</sup> has been updated to reflect Late Biblical Hebrew. His study of textual errors reveals that the “MT did not prove to have the most errors by comparison with 4Q[Sam<sup>a</sup>]” (98). The “high total number of harmonizations [in 4QSam<sup>a</sup>] highlights its exegetical nature” (144). The category “clarifying exegesis” is rather vague and Driesbach subdivides it into (1) clarification of the speaker or addressee in dialogue; (2) clarification of actor; (3) clarification of location; and (4) contextual explications. The results show that 4QSam<sup>a</sup> has a slightly larger number of examples of clarifying exegesis than the MT or the Codex Vaticanus.

4QSam<sup>a</sup> has the largest number of exegetical readings, including readings that are unique to it. The plus בִּשְׂקֵי (“in sackcloth”) in 4QSam<sup>a</sup> in 2 Sam 12,16 (also in the Lucianic witnesses) is categorized as a “scribal embellishment”. In fact, it is a significant exegetical reading that changes the meaning of the passage because it makes explicit the meaning of David’s action. According to the MT, David lies on the ground, and, while the readers know that he is atoning for his sin, his courtiers are utterly confused by his behaviour. But if David puts on sackcloth, as 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and the Lucianic witnesses report, then he could signal his act of penance to his courtiers who might begin to grasp that Bathsheba’s child is David’s son. So Driesbach is right: the 4QSam<sup>a</sup> reading is a scribal embellishment that significantly changes the meaning of this scene.

Driesbach’s fresh reading of the 4QSam<sup>a</sup> plates renders this volume a necessary companion to the official edition of 4QSam<sup>a</sup> (F.M. Cross – D.W. Parry – R.J. Saley – E. Ulrich, *Qumran Cave 4, XII, 1-2 Samuel* [DJD XVII; Oxford 2005]). Many alternative interpretations and reconstructions are suggested. For example, Cross et al. reconstruct 1 Sam 5,8 with אֶת אֲרֶךְ (Qumran Cave 4, 49). But Driesbach notes the possibility that the aleph could be the object marker and it could also be the first letter of אֲרֶךְ. In 2 Sam 18,9, the MT reading וַיִּתֵּן is difficult. S.R. Driver, *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel* (Oxford 1913) 328, suggested וַיִּתֵּל with the LXX and Peshitta. Cross et al. reconstruct the reading וַיִּתֵּל in 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and describe the MT as an error of *lapsus calami* (Qumran Cave 4, 164). But Driesbach notes that the “lamed is not clear” (73). The nun is also not present “since this long letter would have extended to the next line” (75). These helpful observations expand on the brief remarks in the DJD volume.

Driesbach demonstrates with charts and diagrams that 4QSam<sup>a</sup> is fifty per cent more likely than MT or the LXX to contain a secondary reading. In response to one key question in this field — the textual filiation between 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and the LXX — he writes: “4Q and the *Vorlage* of the OG do share a genetic relationship that separates them from MT, but that 4Q’s text has developed significantly since the time when the OG was produced” (281). He also discovers that the numerous unique readings in 4QSam<sup>a</sup> “show a significant degree of independence from G” (281). This is an important insight. Too often in text-critical studies, lists of agreements between two versions have led to erroneous conclusions when the more numerous instances of significant disagreement are ignored. In the end, Driesbach concludes that 4QSam<sup>a</sup> reveals some literary development, but it is not a unique literary edition of Samuel. His evidence reveals that the Codex Vaticanus reflects the text closest to the original. MT is also close to the original, while the

Lucianic witnesses and 4QSam<sup>a</sup> contain the most secondary readings. But because these texts can contain exegetical readings, any of these witnesses may contain the original reading. Because 4QSam<sup>a</sup> is an “inconsistent witness to the text of Samuel” (298), Driesbach argues that its readings should be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

Driesbach acknowledges that text-critical scholars still work without all the necessary data for arriving at exact conclusions about the development of the text of Samuel. He imagines, rightly so, that there were many other texts that are no longer extant. Still, his sober and detailed analysis of 4QSam<sup>a</sup> is the best resource today for understanding the interpretations that these scroll fragments contain.

Pontifical Biblical Institute  
Via della Pilotta 25  
I-00187 Rome

Craig E. MORRISON

# NUNTII PERSONARUM ET RERUM

## PONTIFICIUM INSTITUTUM BIBLICUM ANNUS ACADEMICUS 2016-2017. II SEMESTRE

Auditores inscripti erant 310, qui in diversas categorias sic distribuebantur:

	Ad Doctoratum	Ad Licentiam	Hospites	Universi
Fac. Biblica	50	219	22	291
Fac. Orientalistica	0	1	18	19
Universi	50	220	40	310
Nationes	64	Alumni	310	
Dioceses	148	Alumni	164	
Inst. Religiosorum	39	Alumni	83	
Inst. Religiosarum	17	Alumnae	17	
Ex statu laicali	46	Alumnae	33	
		Alumni	13	

### LAUREA

*Laurae in Re Biblica digni declarati sunt:*

BRUM TEIXEIRA, José Lucas, *Poetics and Narrative Function of Tob 6,2-18* (magna cum laude) – Moderatore: Prof. Luca MAZZINGHI.

NIEDZWIEDZKI, Tomasz Piotr, *The Patriarch and the Other in the Targums* (magna cum laude) – Moderatore: Prof. Craig MORRISON, O.Carm.

SESSA, Salvatore Maurizio, *Consegnarsi al re di Babilonia. Dal gesto simbolico alla «scelta profetica» nell'orizzonte tematico della fine di Gerusalemme (Ger 21,1-10; 26-29; 38,14-28a)* (magna cum laude) – Moderatore: Prof. Pietro BOVATI, S.J.

*Doctores in Re Biblica renuntiati sunt, typis edita thesi:*

KINOWSKI, Krzysztof, *The Meaning of Bloodshed in 2Kgs 21:16, 24:4 in the Context of the Fall of Judah* (Roma 2017), 166 p. [estratto].

WISNIEWSKI, Przemysław Adam, *La discendenza di Aronne. Studio diacronico di Es 24\*; Lv 10\*; Nm 17\*; Nm 27\** (Supplementi alla Rivista Biblica, 62; Bologna: Edizioni Dehoniane, 2017), 280 p.

## LIBRI AD DIRECTIONEM MISSI

The following list mentions books on biblical and related topics sent recently to *Biblica*, including those which may not actually be reviewed in this journal. Inclusion of the book in the list is no indication of the editorial opinion concerning it.

Books sent to this journal will not be returned to the senders, even when no review of them is published in it, unless the book was sent at the request of the editors of *Biblica*.

Please address all books and related correspondence to: Editorial Office, *Biblica*, Pontificio Istituto Biblico, Via della Pilotta 25, I-00187 Roma, Italia.

**Anderson**, Bradford A. – **Gooder**, Paula, *An Introduction to the Study of the Pentateuch* (T&T Clark Approaches to Biblical Studies). London, Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2017. xii-212 p. 14 × 21. \$23.36

**Angami**, Zhoid, *Tribals, Empire and God. A Tribal Reading of the Birth of Jesus in Matthew's Gospel* (T&T Clark Biblical Studies). London, Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2017. xvi-314 p. 16 × 24. £85,50

**Arnal**, William E. – **Ascough**, Richard S. – **Derrenbacker**, Jr., Robert A. – **Harland**, Philip A., eds., *Scribal Practices and Social Structures among Jesus Adherents. Essays in Honor of John S. Kloppenborg* (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 285). Leuven, Peeters, 2016. xxiv-630 p. 16 × 24.5. €115,00

**Arnold**, Brian J., *Justification in the Second Century* (Studies of the Bible and its Reception 9). Berlin, de Gruyter, 2017. xvi-222 p. 15.5 × 23.5. €99,95

**Bauckham**, Richard, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses. The Gospels as Eyewitness Testimony* (second edition). Grand Rapids, MI, William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2017. xxiii-680 p. 16 × 24. \$50.00

**Bray**, Samuel L. – **Hobbins**, John F., *Genesis 1-11. A New Translation for Readers, Scholars, and Translators*. Willmore, KY, GlossaHouse, 2017. x-313 p. 15 × 23. \$14.99

**Breytenbach**, Cillers, ed., *Paul's Graeco-Roman Context* (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 277). Leuven, Peeters, 2015. xxii-751 p. 16 × 24.5. €90,00

**Broadhead**, Edwin K., *The Gospel of Matthew on the Landscape of Antiquity* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 378). Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 2017. xviii-351 p. 16 × 23.5. €139,00

**Brown**, Sherri – **Moloney**, Francis J., *Interpreting the Gospel and Letters of John. An Introduction*. Grand Rapids, MI, William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2017. xvi-366 p. 19 × 24. \$36.00

**Cazeaux**, Jacques, *La Tunique sans Couture* (Lire la Bible 191). Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 2017. 300 p. 13.5 × 21. €24,00

**Church**, Philip, *Hebrews and the Temple. Attitudes to the Temple in Second Temple Judaism and in Hebrews* (Supplements to Novum Testamentum 171). Leiden, Brill, 2017. xviii-615 p. 16 × 24. €156,00

**Collins, John J.**, *The Invention of Judaism*. Torah and Jewish Identity from Deuteronomy to Paul (The Taubman Lectures in Jewish Studies 7). Oakland, CA, University of California Press, 2017. xix-274 p. 15 × 23. \$29.95

**Cook, Sean E.**, *The Solomon Narratives in the Context of the Hebrew Bible*. Told and Retold (Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 638). London, Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2017. x-202 p. 16 × 24. £59.49

**Crouch, C.L.**, *An Introduction to the Study of Jeremiah* (T&T Clark Approaches to Biblical Studies). London, Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2017. xii-212 p. 14 × 21.5. £19.79

**Daly-Denton, Margaret, John**, *An Earth Bible Commentary*. Supposing Him to Be the Gardener. London, Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2017. xvi-247 p. 16 × 24. £65.80

**Dietrich, Walter**, ed., in collaboration with Cynthia Edenburg and Philippe Hugo, *The Books of Samuel*. Stories – History – Reception History (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 284). Leuven, Peeters, 2016. xxix-650 p. 16 × 24.5. €96,00

**Dixon, Sarah S.U.**, *The Testimony of the Exalted Jesus in the Book of Revelation* (Library of New Testament Studies 579). London, Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2017. xv-184 p. 16 × 24. £59.50

**Dyer, Bryan R.**, *Suffering in the Face of Death*. The Epistle to the Hebrews and Its Context of Situation (Library of New Testament Studies 568). London, Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2017. xiii-209 p. 16 × 24. €76,49

**Edwards, Dennis R.**, *1 Peter* (The Story of God Bible Commentary). Grand Rapids, MI, Zondervan, 2017. 240 p. 15 × 23. \$29.99

**Elledge, C.D.**, *Resurrection of the Dead in Early Judaism 200 BCE – CE 200*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2017. xiii-253 p. 16 × 24. £65.00

**Elledge, Roderick**, *Use of the Third Person for Self-Reference by Jesus and Yahweh*. A Study of Illeism in the Bible and Ancient Near Eastern Texts and Its Implications for Christology (Library of New Testament Studies 575). London, Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2017. xiv-182 p. 16 × 24. £59.50

**Faessler, Marc**, *Le Rêve*. L'«autre scène» du livre de la Genèse (Essais Bibliques N° 52). Genève, Éditions Labor et Fides, 2017. xv-265 p. 14 × 22.5. £17.00

**Feinman, Peter**, *Jerusalem Throne Games*. The Battle of Bible Stories after the Death of David. Oxford, Oxbow Books, 2017. xii-418 p. 17 × 24. £30.00

**Fletcher, Michelle**, *Reading Revelation as Pastiche*. Imitating the Past (Library of New Testament Studies 571). London, Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2017. xiv-256 p. 15 × 24. £59.50

**Flórez, Juan David Figueroa**, *Con la Diestra en La Espalda*. Estudio sobre las imágenes de Dios y su actuar en Lamentaciones (Tesi Gregoriana, Serie Teologia 231). Roma, Pontificia Università Gregoriana, 2017. 234 p. 17 × 24. €17,00

**Grabbe, Lester L.**, *Ancient Israel*. What Do We Know and How Do We Know It? (Revised Edition). London, Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2017. xxii-365 p. 15.5 × 23.5. £19.79

**Grabbe, Lester L.**, ed., *The Land of Canaan in the Late Bronze Age* (Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 636). London, Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2016. v-236 p. 16 × 24. £76.50

**Green, Barbara**, *David's Capacity for Compassion*. A Literary-Hermeneutical Study of 1–2 Samuel (Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 641). London, Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2017. xiii-317 p. 16 × 24. £76.50



**Hagelia**, Hallvard – **Zehnder**, Markus, eds., *Interreligious Relations: Biblical Perspectives*. Proceedings from the Second Norwegian Summer Academy for Biblical Studies (NSABS), Ansgar University College, Kristiansand, Norway, August 2015 (T&T Clark Biblical Studies). London, Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2017. xxiv-353 p. 16 × 24. £59.49

**Harding**, Mark – **Nobbs**, Alanna, eds., *Into all the World*. Emergent Christianity in Its Jewish and Greco-Roman Context. Grand Rapids, MI, William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2017. xxii-403 p. 15.5 × 23.5. \$55.00

**Haudebert**, Pierre, *L'Évangile de Marc* (Mon ABC de la Bible). Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 2017. 167 p. 12.5 × 19.5. €12,00

**Hirsch-Luipold**, Rainer, *Gott wahrnehmen*. Die Sinne im Johannesevangelium. Ratio Religionis Studien IV (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 374). Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 2017. xvi-428 p. 16 × 23.5. €134,00

**Holladay**, Carl R., *Introduction to the New Testament*. Reference Edition. Waco, TX, Baylor University Press, 2017. xl-968 p. 17.5 × 25.5. \$89.95

**Hölscher**, Michael, *Matthäus liest Q*. Eine Studie am Beispiel von Mt 11,2-19 und Q 7,18-35 (Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen, Neue Folge 60). Münster, Aschendorff Verlag, 2017. viii-408 p. 16 × 24.5. €39,50

**Irudayaraj**, Dominic S., *Violence, Otherness and Identity in Isaiah 63:1-6*. The Trampling One Coming from Edom (Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 633). London, Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2016. xvii-200 p. 16 × 24. £76.50

**Jacobsen**, Anders-Christian, ed., *Origeniana Undecima*. Origen and Origenism in the History of Western Thought (Papers of the 11th International Origen Congress, Aarhus University, 26-31 August 2013) (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 279). Leuven, Peeters, 2016. xvi-978 p. 16 × 24.5. €125,00

**Kalimi**, Isaac, *Fighting over the Bible*. Jewish Interpretation, Sectarianism and Polemic from Temple to Talmud and Beyond (The Brill Reference Library of Judaism 54). Leiden, Brill, 2017. xi-342 p. 16 × 24. €138,00

**Keady**, Jessica M., *Vulnerability and Valour*. A Gendered Analysis of Everyday Life in the Dead Sea Scrolls Community (Library of Second Temple Studies 91). London, Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2017. xiii-204 p. 16 × 24. \$77.39

**Kiboko**, J. Kabamba, *Divining the Woman of Endor*. African Culture, Post-colonial Hermeneutics, and the Politics of Biblical Translation (Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 644). London, Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2017. xxxii-278 p. 16 × 24. \$77.39

**Kozlova**, Ekaterina E., *Maternal Grief in the Hebrew Bible* (Oxford Theology and Religion Monographs). Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2017. xv-246 p. 16 × 24. £65.00

**Krause**, Andrew R., *Synagogues in the Works of Flavius Josephus*. Rhetoric, Spatiality, and First-Century Jewish Institutions (Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity 97). Leiden, Brill, 2017. xiv-265 p. 16 × 23.5. €120,00

**Lambrecht**, Jan, *In Search of Meaning*. Collected Notes on the New Testament (2014-2017). Balti, Republic of Moldova, Scholars Press, 2017. vi-562 p. 15 × 22. \$84.00

**Matoses**, Xavier, «*Quien Tenga Oídod...*». Estudio Teológico-Narrativo del «Escuchar» en el Evangelio de Marcos (Colectánea Sant Pacià 117). Barcelona, Editions de la Facultat de Teologia de Catalunya (ASUP), 2016. 386 p. 15.5 × 22. €22,00

**Millet, Olivier – de Robert, Philippe**, *Précis de culture biblique* (Quadrige Manuels). Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, 2017. xvi-557 p. 12.5 × 19.5. €25,00

**Moller, Hilde Brekke**, *The Vermes Quest. The Significance of Geza Vermes for Jesus Research* (Library of New Testament Studies 576). London, Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2017. xiii-241 p. 16 × 24. £59.50

**Moore, Rickie D. – Peterson, Brian Neil**, *Voice, Word, and Spirit. A Pentecostal Old Testament Survey*. Nashville, TN, Abingdon Press, 2017. xiv-296 p. 25 × 20. \$34.99

**Morrow, William S.**, *An Introduction to the Bible*. Grand Rapids, MI, William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2017. xvi-270 p. 15 × 23. \$24.00

**Murcia, Thierry**, *Marie appelée la Magdaléenne*. Entre traditions et histoire I<sup>er</sup>-VIII<sup>e</sup> siècle (Héritages méditerranéens). Aix-en-Provence, Université de Provence, 2017. 418 p. 16 × 24. €25,00

**Nagole, François Batuafé**, *L'accomplissement de toute Justice*. Approche pragmatique du procès dialogique entre Jésus et Jean-Baptiste dans l'Évangile de Matthieu (Publications Universitaires Européennes 956). Frankfurt am Main, Peter Lang, 2017. 374 p. 15 × 21. \$69.33

**Navarro Puerto, Mercedes**, *Jesús y su sombra*. El mal, las sombras, lo desconocido y amenazante en el evangelio de Marcos (Estudios Bíblicos 30). Estella (Navarra), Editorial Verbo Divino, 2017. 360 p. 16 × 24. €34,00

**Nelson, Richard D.**, *Judges*. A Critical and Rhetorical Commentary. London, Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2017. v-376 p. 16 × 24. \$133.20

**Novenson, Matthew V.**, *The Grammar of Messianism*. An Ancient Jewish Political Idiom and Its Users. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2017. xvi-361 p. 16 × 24. £56.00

**Pleins, J. David**, *Biblical Hebrew Vocabulary by Conceptual Categories*. A Student's Guide to Nouns in the Old Testament. Grand Rapids, MI, Zondervan, 2017. 176 p. 15 × 23. \$17.99

**Ruiz-Ortiz, Francisco-Javier**, *The Dynamics of Violence and Revenge in the Hebrew Book of Esther* (Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 175). Leiden, Brill, 2017. xiv-275 p. 16 × 24.5. €110,00

**Sevrin, Jean-Marie**, *Le Quatrième Évangile*. Recueil d'études. Édités par G. van Belle (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 281). Leuven, Peeters, 2016. xiv-281 p. 16 × 24.5. €80,00

**Somov, Alexey**, *Representations of the Afterlife in Luke-Acts* (Library of New Testament Studies 556). London, Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2017. xvi-268 p. 16 × 24. €77,39

**Tabb, Brian J.**, *Suffering in Ancient Worldview*. Luke, Seneca, and 4 Maccabees in Dialogue (Library of New Testament Studies 569). London, Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2017. xvii-200 p. 16 × 24. £76.50

**Tucker, Jr., W. Dennis – Bellinger, Jr., William H.**, *The Psalter as Witness*. Theology, Poetry, and Genre (Proceedings from the Baylor University – University of Bonn Symposium on the Psalter). Waco, TX, Baylor University Press, 2017. xii-204 p. 16 × 23.5. \$49.95

**Venard, O.-T.**, ed., *Saint Paul, Épître aux Philippiens* (La Bible en ses Traditions 2) Leuven, Peeters, 2016. 174 p. 30 × 24.5. €85,00

**Vermeylen, Jacques**, *Métamorphoses*. Les rédactions successives du Livre de Job (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 276). Leuven, Peeters, 2015. xvi-410 p. 16 × 24.5. €84,00

**Wasserman**, Tommy – **Andersson**, Greger – **Willgren**, David, eds., *Studies in Isaiah. History, Theology and Reception* (Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 654). London, Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2017. xxii-234 p. 16 × 24. £76.49

**Wilk**, Florian – **Gemeinhardt**, Peter, eds., *Transmission and Interpretation of the Book of Isaiah in the Context of Intra- and Interreligious Debates* (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 280). Leuven, Peeters, 2016. xiv-281 p. 16 × 24.5. €95,00

**Zevit**, Ziony, ed., *Subtle Citation, Allusion, and Translation in the Hebrew Bible*. Sheffield (UK), Equinox Publishing, 2017. vii-253 p. 15.5 × 23. £22.95

## NOTICE TO OUR SUBSCRIBERS

With this notice I announce a change in the editorial leadership of *Biblica*. After seven years of faithful service as OT Editor, Jean Louis Ska, S.J., has decided to leave this position. On behalf of the other members of the editorial staff and, indeed, of our many contributors and subscribers, I would like to thank Fr. Ska for his generous dedication and leadership in the oversight of our journal. He has been not only an invaluable source of wisdom and clarity for the other members of the editorial staff, but also an inspiring editor, bringing out the best from all the contributors to the journal.

I am also pleased to announce the appointment of Dominik Markl, S.J. as the new OT Editor for *Biblica*. Together with the other members of the editorial staff, we pledge our full support to Fr. Markl as he takes on this new and challenging role.

Michael KOLARCIK, S.J., Rector  
Pontifical Biblical Institute

## LEO ARNOLD, S. J.

R.I.P.

On July 2, 2017, Rev. Leo Arnold, S.J., died peacefully in the Jesuit infirmary in Rome at the age of 88. Fr. Arnold was born in Bournemouth, England, on February 14, 1929, and entered the British Province of the Society of Jesus in 1946. He was ordained to the priesthood on July 31, 1958. After the early years of formation he specialized in Arabic studies and spent several years teaching at the Université de Saint-Joseph in Beirut before arriving at the Pontifical Biblical Institute in Rome in 1979, where he taught Arabic until his retirement in 2009. Fr. Arnold was Editorial Assistant of *Biblica* from 1988 until June of last year, when illness forced him to relinquish the position. He managed several of the technical aspects of the periodical, such as correcting the English of many articles, proofreading, and processing books that arrived for review. Many of the collaborators of *Biblica* benefited – unknowingly – from his precise, faithful, and anonymous labors. He went about his tasks with constant assiduousness and a readiness to be of assistance, and his devotion to detail and constant good humor will be missed by all associated with *Biblica*.